MC Libraries
3 5217 00369 1978

215
M365h
M.C.

HELL AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS

CHRIST OR EVOLUTION WHICH?

BY

T. T. MARTIN,

Evangelist.

AUTHOR OF

GEMS FROM THE SICK ROOM.
CONVERSION OF RUTH WYATT.
GOD'S PLAN WITH MEN.
REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH.
THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.
THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.
GOING TO HELL IN DROVES.
MARRIED LIFE—ITS PRESENT-DAY DANGER AND EVILS.
HELL, HEAVEN AND OTHER SERMONS.

KANSAS CITY, MO.
THE WESTERN BAPTIST PUBLISHING CO.
1923

20486

CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction 5

CHAPTER I

The Issue Stated 17

CHAPTER II

What Is Evolution? 37

CHAPTER III

What Is Being Taught in our Schools? 47

CHAPTER IV

Evolution Is Not a Science 72

CHAPTER V

Evolution Repudiated by Great Scientists and Scholars 105

CHAPTER VI

The Effects of Evolution on Teachers of It 139

CHAPTER VIII

Effects of Evolution on Students 147

CHAPTER VIII

The Only Hope 156

CHAPTER IX

The Responsibility of Fathers and Mothers 160

Conclusion 166

INTRODUCTION

"To attack an abuse of men claiming to represent science is not only a privilege but a duty, and he who shirks it through fear of criticism or through dread of precipitating a controversy in which he himself may lose prestige is no lover of truth."—McCann.

BAPTISTS, Catholics, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and others, believe there is a hell, with the exception of the hypocrites among us and a few who have been honestly misled by two pleas: First, that the word for "hell" means "the grave." Let us see: "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God" (Ps. 9:17). Does that mean that the wicked shall be turend into the grave, that the others will not be buried at all? "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John 3:36). Does God's wrath abide on something that has ceased to exist, upon a pile of ashes? "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). Everlasting contempt for a pile of ashes, for something that has ceased to exist?

The second plea that has misled some is that the Bible says that "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23), not Hell, making death to mean "to cease to exist." Death does not mean "to cease to exist." "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. 5:6). She "is dead," but she has not "ceased to exist"—she is cut off from God. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life" (John 5:24)—not is passed from non-existence into existence, but is passed from being cut off from, separated from, God. "This is life eternal that they might know Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." (John 17:3).

The rank and file, the great body, of professing Christians in these great denominations believe there is a hell; the teaching

of the Scriptures is plain. As an example of the Scripture's teaching, the Saviour said: "If thy hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands go into hell, into the unquenchable fire. And if thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life halt, rather than having two feet to be cast into Hell. And if thine eye cause thee to stumble cast it out: it is good for thee to enter into the Kingdom of God with one eye rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell; where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:43-48, R. V.)

The evidence is plain and positive that the Scriptures are a revelation from God. Professor James Orr, at the time of his death probably the most learned man on the earth, stated that of the greatest thirty infidels of our day and time he knew twenty-eight of them in their old age, and that every one of them, after mature investigation, had accepted the Bible as a revelation from God, and Jesus Christ as their Saviour. William E. Gladstone stated that in his life he had known the greatest sixty men of the world and that fifty-five of them had accepted the Bible as a revelation from God, and Jesus Christ as their Saviour. Space forbids giving the list of great infidels, such as Lord Littleton, Gilbert West, George Romanes, who were convinced by thorough, honest investigation that the Bible is a revelation from God, and that Jesus Christ is the Saviour. The evidence is plain and positive, for ignorant and learned alike. No honest man, ignorant or learned, can read "Walker's Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," or John Urquhart's "Wonders of Prophecy," or E. Y. Mullins, "Why Is Christianity True?" or Nelson's "The Cause and Cure of Infidelity," or A. T. Pierson's "Many Infallible Proofs," and not be convinced that the Bible is a revelation from God and that Jesus Christ is the Saviour. There are many others, among them, "The Word and Works of God," by Bailey, "The Character of Jesus," by Horace Bushnell, "Mriacles of Unbelief," by Ballard, "The Problem of the Old Testament," by Jonus Orr, "Did Jesus Rise," by J. H. Brookes, "The Resurrection of Jesus," by James Orr, "The Young Professor," by E. B. Hatcher, "Reasons for Faith in Christianity," by Leavitt, "Creation," by Arnold Guyot, "The Resurrection of Our Lord," by W. Milligan. I could fill

this book with testimonies of great men that the Bible is God's revelation to man. Let me give a few:

Lord Kelvin, the greatest scientist on earth at the time of his death, stated, toward the close of his life, that there is not a single established fact of science which is in conflict with any statement of the Bible.

Sir David Brewster, doubtless the greatest scientist the world has ever known, signed a statement, together with seven hundred and fifty-three other scientists, that there is not one single fact of real science that conflicts with the Bible.

"The time is perhaps nearer than we anticipate when natural science and theology will unite in the conviction that the first chapter of Genesis stands alone among the traditions of mankind in the wonderful simplicity and grandeur of its words, and that the meaning of these words is always a meaning ahead of science, not because it anticipates the results of science, but because it is independent of them and runs, as it were, round the outer margin of all possible discovery."—Duke of Argyle.

"Who educated the first human pair? A Spirit interested himself in them, as is laid down by an old, venerable, primeval document which, taken altogether, contains the profoundest, sublimest wisdom and discloses results to which all philosophy must at last come."—Fichte.

"I have always found in my scientific studies that when I could get the Bible to say anything on the subject, it afforded me a firm platform to stand upon and a round in the ladder by which I could safely ascend."—Lieut. Maury, U. S. Navy, distinguished on account of both his valuable scientific discoveries and his published works.

"All human discoveries seem to be made only for the purpose of confirming more and more strongly the truths contained in the Holy Scriptures."—Sir John Herschell.

These great bodies of professing Christians believe that the only hope for responsible human beings not going to hell when they die is through our Saviour, God's Son, as our real Redeemer. Witness: "But as for me I know that my *Redeemer* liveth, and at last He will stand upon the earth: And after my skin, even this body is destroyed, then without my flesh shall I see God,—Job. 19:25-26. "And He will *redeem* Israel from all his iniquities,"—Ps. 130:8; "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastise-

ment of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."—Isa. 53:5-6; "the son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a *ransom* for many.—Mt. 20:28; "this is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many unto *REMISSION* of sins,—Mt. 26:28; "being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,"—Rom. 3:24; "Christ *redeemed* us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us,"—Gal. 3:13; "in whom we have our *redemption* through His blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of His grace,"—Eph. 1:7; "knowing that ye were *redeemed* not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ,"—I Peter 1:18-19; "nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal *redemption*,"—Heb. 9:12; "Looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave Himself for us that He might *redeem* us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works,"—Titus 2:13-14; "And they sing a new song saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou art slain and did purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue and people and nation,"—Rev. 5:9. Now there could not be *REAL* redemption, the Saviour could not be a *REAL* Redeemer, but only a miserable make-shift, if He were not *REAL* Deity, *REALLY* God's Son.

But if Evolution, which is being taught in our High Schools, is true, the Saviour was not Deity, but only the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and the world is left without a real Saviour, a real Redeemer, and only hell is left for responsible human beings. The teaching of Evolution leaves no room for Jesus Christ's being Deity, but forces the teaching that He must have had a human father as well as mother. Not only so, but Evolution teaches not simply development within species,—every farmer, every stockman, every poultryman, believes that; that is the reason we line-breed; that is the reason we send our

children to school; Evolution teaches that everything evolved from protoplasm, from the first amoeba, from the first living cell, not as big as the point of a needle; that the diferent species, man included, were evolved from the first living thing just above the non-living; that by very slight changes from generation to generation for millions of years, new species were evolved up to and including man.

Now, Genesis says positively ten times in the first chapter that everything brought forth "after its kind;" Evolution says that there are ten lies in the first chapter of Genesis; that everything did not bring forth "after his kind;" Genesis says that God created man in His own image; Evolution says that there is another lie in the book of Genesis—that the first man was midway between the anthropoid ape and modern man; Genesis says that the first man spoke plainly; Evolution says that there is another lie in Genesis: that the first man chattered like animals in trees, having only exclamations of pain or pleasure.

The Saviour endorsed Genesis as the word of God; Deity would not endorse these lies as the word of God, if Evolution is true, and it is being taught as true in the High Schools throughout the land; then the Saviour whom we trust for redemption and whom we worship, was not Deity, but only the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman; therefore the world is left without a real Redeemer; therefore hell is the home of all responsible human beings.

John McDowell Leavitt: "Take Jesus from the world and you turn it into gloom." Take His Deity and real redemption away and you turn the world into hell.

It will be shown in this book that the teaching of Evolution is being drilled into our boys and girls in our High Schools during the most susceptible, dangerous age of their lives. It is true that it is being taught in the lower grades of our public schools, even down to the primary department, as will be shown in this book; and it is being taught in our State Universities and State Normals. But attention is especially directed here to Evolution in the High Schools, for three reasons: First, because it is the most susceptible, dangerous age of our young people; second,—comparatively few of the High School students go through the State Universities; vastly more, therefore, are being poisoned and eternally damned in the High Schools than in

the Universities; third, the great State Universities and State Normals are barricaded behind strong political influences and millions of money, and they are hard to reach; from this barricaded position they can, in their high-browed arrogance, snap their fingers in our faces—until we can arouse the people to elect legislators who will cut off all appropriations wherever Evolution is taught, and mark my words,—it will be done. Are we under the heel of a worse than the Czar of Russia, to take our taxes from us and then ram down the throats of our children whatever they please? Ramming poison down the throats of our children is nothing compared with damning their souls with the teaching of Evolution, that robs them of a revelation from God and a real Redeemer. Have we, while asleep, been dragged back under "taxation without representation?" The men are angels, who will take my child from me and, under the plea of science, pour poison down its throat, compared to men who take my child away from home into the public schools, and, under the plea of science—when it is neither truth nor science—pour Evolution into its mind and damn its soul.

The plea will be made that many pass through the High Schools, and even the State Universities and State Normals, without being poisoned, without giving up the Bible as revelation from God and the Saviour as Redeemer. That is true: in many cases the training in the home, under the pastors and priests and in the Sunday Schools, has been so effective that they are able to escape; even so, many, because of the physical training, the strength, the health given to their bodies, are able to pass through our epidemics of small-pox, or of yellow fever, without taking it and dying; but that is no reason for forcing our children to be exposed to small-pox or yellow fever. Many do die from small-pox and yellow fever, and many, many, as will be shown in this book, are being damned eternally by the teaching of Evolution in our schools.

The third reason why this book is sent forth to warn against Evolution in the High Schools is that the scourge can be soonest reached and stopped there.

The Boards of Trustees of the public schools are absolute sovereigns; they can put in or put out whatever teacher they will; no power on earth can force teachers on them; in practically every school community in the land, Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presby-

terians and other professed Christian fathers and mothers are vastly in the majority; they can put on the Boards of Trustees only men and women who will not employ any teacher who believes in Evolution; who will not employ any teacher who will not pledge to post himself or herself on the facts against Evolution, and expose it every time it comes up in any text book. And then carry the fight to the people and educate them until we can elect legislatures that will cut off all appropriations wherever Evolution is taught. They have us by the throat—it is the only way to break their strangle hold.

But the reader may ask: "Why not meet these great professors who teach Evolution and discuss with them and go to the bottom of the matter?" Meet them! They will not meet! Catch, if you can, some great State University, or Chicago University, or Columbia University, choosing a man as a representative to meet in public discussion and have the debate stenographically reported and published in book form, Philip Mauro, the lawyer of New York, or Alfred W. McCann, LL. D., the lawyer of New York, or George McCready Price, the scientist of California, or J. W. Porter of Kentucky, or W. B. Riley of Minneapolis, Minnesota, or L. W. Munhall of Pennsylvania, or R. A. Torrey of Los Angeles,—or William Jennings Bryan! They will discuss with an untrained school boy in the school room, where they have every advantage, but catch one of them, will you, discussing with a man who is posted, and open and above board!

It will be claimed that there are men who believe in Evolution who are devout Christians. Let the reader consider:

First. There are men who are great along some lines of learning who are not clear in their reasoning; they are not logical in their thinking; they would not know logic if they met it in the road. Any man who will only think clearly and honestly knows that it is absolutely impossible to reconcile Evolution and the ten-times-repeated statement in Genesis that everything brought forth "after its kind," and the Saviour endorsing Genesis as the word of God, with the Deity of the Saviour; and if He was not Deity He was not a real Redeemer. If these things can be reconciled, *WHY DON'T SOME OF THE EVOLUTIONISTS SHOW THE RECONCILIATION?* This has been put up to them over and over, and they remain as dumb as oysters—and they will continue to pass it by in silence.

Second. Some men say they believe in Evolution, when they mean by it development within the species, as the stalk of corn from the grain, the oak from the acorn, the chicken from the egg,—that is not Evolution, and they know it,—they say they believe in Evolution so as to appear learned.

Third. Men claim to be Christians, and believe in Evolution, when they do not, down in their souls, believe that Christ really redeemed us—actually died for our sins.

Fourth. Men claim to be Christians, and believe in Evolution, and say that they believe that Christ was divine, but they believe that human beings are divine, that God is the Father of human beings, and so we are all divine; but down in their souls they believe that the Saviour had a human father as well as mother,—they have not the manhood to come out and say so—they do not believe He had pre-existence.

Fifth. I have never known a prominent Evolutionist who claimed to be a Christian, who ever in public emphasized the fact of redemption through the blood of Christ, of redemption through Christ dying for our sins, until driven by exposure or by public sentiment to make such a statement.

I quote from five of the great Evolutionists of the world, who claim to be Christians:

"God is not a bookkeeper recording in his ledger the daily deeds of men and issuing his curse on those who fail in any requirement of the law,—but a righteous God loving righteousness in men and faith by which men come into fellowship with him." "A conception that he is a mere legalistic judge of men, ignoring their striving, their aspiration and their faith and pronouncing on them a curse because they have failed to fulfill all the requirements of the law."

"No New Testament writer teaches the doctrine that the death of Jesus satisfies a demand of God that sin shall be punished, or is substitutionary in the sense that in it Jesus endures the punishment due to others."

"The divine nature no longer sits apart in cold clouds, concerning itself with man only in the imposition of an arbitrary legislation from which it is itself exempt, and exacting the last farthing of the penalty of its violation."

"He came to save the lost by making to them a concrete revelation of the truth."

"But what in Jesus' mind is the attitude of God toward the sinner? That attitude is neither the imperial nor the judicial, but, as we should expect, the paternal."

"The Father's law of obedience is the security of the family."

"The breach is healed when the cause of it ceases to exist. The essential and sufficient condition of reconciliation is the change of man's attitude to God."

"The cross was not a device by which a far-away God enabled men to cancel their debt of sin."

"To win the approval of God one has simply to achieve a character that will merit approval."

"A humble and contrite heart is the only recommendation that a sinner needs with God. It is precisely the kind of atonement that every right-minded parent desires from a wayward child."

"Taking an immunity bath in a fountain filled with blood." "Moral justice cannot take the innocent for the guilty, even if the innocent would offer itself. To suppose justice to do this is to destroy the principle of its existence, which is the thing itself. It is then no longer justice; it is indiscriminate revenge."

These expressions are from a great college president emeritus, a great university president and three professors who train young preachers, all Evolutionists and they all deny that Christ died for our sins.

Sixth. Some learned professors, by mental contortions or theological sleight-of-hand, may be able to believe in Evolution and at the same time to believe the Bible to be really the word of God and the Saviour to be real Deity and our real Redeemer. but your honest High School boy and girl who think cannot, and with many of them it will mean at last—hell; hence, the subject of this book, "Hell and the High School."

And the blame for their doom I lay at the feet of the fathers and mothers of America who, cowering before the sneers of a lot of high-brows supported by your taxes, will not arise and through your local Boards of Trustees, drive every Evolutionist from our High Schools, and through your legislatures cut off all public funds where the Bible-denying, soul-destroying error is taught.

I know their pleas, I know their dodgings,—they will be met fairly and squarely in this book.

What is one boy's or girl's soul worth?
Whose boy, whose girl, will it be?
Where is your Christian manhood and womanhood?

Are you a preacher, and because of the high-brows in your congergation, because of their sneers, or because they will cut off your salary, or because they will work up opposition to you as pastor, you will not enter the fight, and you will let your child and the child of your neighbor be damned? Are you a grocery man or a dry goods merchant, and because you may lose a customer or two, will not enter this fight? Are you a society woman and you fear to injure your popularity, and so will leave this fight to others? Are you a boot-licking politician and for the sake of a few votes will you let your child's soul be damned to an eternity in hell?

"Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart early from Mount Gilead."

BUT: "Curse ye Meroz," said the angel of the Lord, "curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

We gave our sons to save the world from being crushed by the Germans, and we did well; but they had already stealthily crept in and captured our citadels of learning, and now they and their dupes are damning our children. The soul of one High School boy or girl sent to hell by your German Evolution is worth more than the bodies of all our brave boys killed in the great war in Europe. But they are being sent to hell by the thousands, as I shall show.

"But you are persecuting us professors!" Ah! Sissie! You have played the high-brow long enough. Now stand up and take your medicine.

But instead of standing up like men and meeting the issue, and meeting men in discussion and showing that their Evolution is right, is the truth and ought to be taught, they are, in their arrogance and pride, putting themselves above discussion and branding all who dare call their Bible-destroying, soul-damning teaching in question as a set of ignoramuses, sneering that their opposers are not "scientists." Well, a man does not have to be a hen to be a judge of an egg, and this is a nest full of bad eggs. Or, in their self-assumed superiority, they maintain a dignified, sublime silence,—on the principle that a fool may be considered by some as wise, if he will but keep his mouth shut.

Or, as they are now beginning to do, they are playing the baby act, and whining for what they call "Academic Freedom," "Academic Liberty." One of them has recently put it thus: "The teacher should be allowed to teach as he sincerely believes. Not otherwise can he retain his self-respect, the confidence of his pupils or the respect of the public." I deny it! Shall teachers be allowed to teach that there is no such thing as disease and keep small-pox pupils in the schools? But the teacher who would thus teach and spread small-pox through the school would do far less harm than the one who teaches Evolution and spreads it among the pupils; for small-pox would only damn their bodies, while Evolution would damn their souls. Should teachers be allowed "academic freedom" to teach the anarchistic-communistic proletariat, "Down with the Church! Down with the State! Down with private property!"? That teaching could only damn the body; the teaching of Evolution damns the soul. Shall the teacher be allowed "academic freedom" to teach a pluarlity of wives? Are we slaves? Are there no limitations? Where will you draw the line? In the nature of the case, the limitations must be drawn by those who pay for the teaching: where else can the line be drawn? A man, dead drunk, staggered out of a saloon to the street waving his arms widlly, and hit a passer-by on the nose. The passer-by quickly hit the drunkard under the jaw and knocked him into the gutter. The drunken man staggered to his feet and stammered, "Don- don- don't you believe in personal liberty?" "Yes!" replied the gentleman, "but your liberty ends where my nose begins." Every teacher's liberty ends where injury to the body, mind or soul of the pupil begins. Who is to be the judge? The ones who pay for the teaching. Let the teacher who wishes to teach otherwise have liberty to teach, yes, but at his own expense, or at the expense of those who wish to pay for that kind of teaching.

"But you are fighting science!" We shall see.

CHAPTER I

The Issue Stated.

LET it be clearly understood and kept in mind that this is not fighting science. William E. Gladstone and Sir Robert Anderson of England, Lord Kelvin and Dr. Virchow and many great scientists of Europe who opposed and exposed Evolution cannot be written down as fighting science. Philip Mauro, the New York lawyer, and Alfred W. McCann, LL. D., the New York lawyer, and Professor Geo. McCready Price, the California scientist, and Wm. Jennings Bryan and Prof. L. T. Townsend of Boston University, and R. A. Torrey and W. B. Riley and a host of others who are opposing and exposing Evolution, cannot be written down as enemies of science; and it is babyish, it is sissy, it is unworthy of men who claim to be educated men, to thus try to becloud the issue and hide behind such a miserable dodge. It will be shown in Chapter IV that Evolution is not science; and it will be shown in Chapter V that the great body of the really great scientists utterly repudiated it.

Further, it is not the issue of having religion taught in the public schools. As a matter of fact, religion ought to be taught throughout the child's entire public school period. Man has three natures—the body, the mind, the soul. The State School can educate the body, the mind, but cannot educate the soul. The denominational school educates the whole man—body, mind, soul. What is the result? The denominational schools, with their generally poorer equipment, have put nearly nine times as many men in the book "Who's Who

in America" as the State Schools with their magnificent equipments—one-third of the man they do not and cannot educate. There ought to be, there could be, some plan devised by which one period each day should be given to religious education; not by the State, but by representatives of each religious denomination, coming and teaching in the school rooms, or in the near-by buildings. But this fight is not to unite Church and State; it is not to have religion taught in public schools. It is that the public schools, from primary through University, shall not be used to fight the Bible, to fight religion, to kill out the Bible and religion in the lives of the pupils. *If the State is not to teach religion it is certainly not to tear down religion. It is just as much a violation of the Constitution to tear down religion as it is to teach religion.* The Constitution of our country guarantees freedom of religion and separation of Church and State—will any one dare claim that the State has the right, through the teachers and the professors in the State schools, to undermine religion, to teach so as to destroy faith in the Bible and in the Saviour; to teach the most deadly, Christ-denying, soul-destroying infidelity that the world has known since Adam; simply because a lot of half-baked scientists have taken up the cast-off, camouflaging garment of German infidelity and rationalism and are masquerading in it under the guise of science, when there is no science in it? This will be clearly shown in Chapter IV. In Chapters VI and VII its effects on teachers and pupils will be shown.

No living man is better fitted to state this tremendous issue than Hon. William Jennings Bryan. (Far, far be the day when the telegraph wires shall flash the message to the ends of the earth that the world's first

citizen, the Statesman, the Philanthropist, the Christian, William Jennings Bryan, is no more among us!) He knows America as no other man; he knows this question from the scientific standpoint, from the legal standpoint, from the religious standpoint. Hear him:

"Now that the legislatures of the various states are in session, I beg to call attention of the legislators to a much needed reform, viz., the elimination of the teaching of atheism and agnosticism from schools, colleges and universities supported by taxation. Under the pretense of teaching science, instructors who draw their salaries from the public treasury are undermining the religious faith of students by substituting belief in Darwiniasm for belief in the Bible. Our Constitution very properly prohibits the teaching of religion at public expense. The Christian church is divided into many sects, Protestant and Catholic, and it is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, as well as to the written law, to use money raised by taxation for the propagation of sects. In many states they have gone so far as to eliminate the reading of the Bible, although its morals and literature have a value entirely distinct from the religious interpretations variously placed upon the Bible.

"Quietly and unnoticed, the enemies of the Bible have been substituting irreligion for religion. Having excluded the teaching of religion, they are daily teaching that which cannot be true if the Bible is true. They do not always openly attack the Bible, but that which they teach is built upon the theory that the Bible is untrue. Many of these teachers are atheists, and do not believe in either a personal God or a personal immorality, as Professor Leuba, of Bryn Mawr, shows in his book, 'Belief in God and Immortality.' Professor Leuba has himself rejected belief in a personal God and belief

in a personal immortality, and presents evidence to show that a majority of the prominent scientists agree with him.

"Some deny that they are atheists, preferring rather to call themselves agnostics, it being easier to plead ignorance than to defend atheism. Darwin declared himself to be an agnostic, having substituted his hypothesis and its implications for the Bible. Darwin began life a Christian, but finding that his hypothesis was inconsistent with the fundamental teachings of Christianity, he rejected the Bible as an inspired Book, and with it the Christ of whom the Bible tells. Darwin declared himself an agnostic, and said that the beginning of all things was a mystery insoluble by man.

"The tendency of Darwinianism, although unsupported by any substantial fact in nature, since no species has been shown to come from any other species, is to destroy faith in a personal God, faith in the Bible as an inspired Book, and faith in Christ as Son and Saviour.

"The so-called theistic evolutionists refuse to admit that they are atheists, contending that they believe in a God back of creation; they argue that evolution is God's method, but they put God so far away as to practically destroy a sense of God's presence in the daily life and a sense of responsibility to Him. At least, that is the tendency, and since the so-called theistic evolutinoists borrow all their facts from atheistic evolutionists and differ from them only in the origin of life, theistic evolution may be described as an anaesthetic administered to young Christians to deaden the pain while their religion is being removed by the materialists.

"When the Christians of the nation understand the demoralizing influence of this godless doctrine, *they*

will refuse to allow it to be taught at public expense. Christianity is not afraid of truth, because truth comes from God, no matter by whom it is discovered or proclaimed, but there is no reason why Christians should tax themselves to pay teachers to exploit guesses and hypotheses as if they were true.

"The only thing that Christians need to do now is to bring the enemies of the Bible into the open and compel them to meet the issue as it is. As soon as the methods of the atheists, agnostics, and Darwinists are exposed, they raise a cry that freedom of conscience is being attacked. That is false, there is no interference with freedom of conscience in this country, and should be none. Christians will be just as prompt as atheists to oppose any attempt to interfere with absolute freedom of cinscience. The atheist has just as much civil right to deny God as the Christian has to believe God; the agnostic has just as much right to profess ignorance in regard to God's existence as the Christian has to profess his faith in the existence of God. The right of conscience is not menaced in this country, it is inviolable.

"Neither do Christians object to the teaching of atheism and agnosticism by those who believe in these doctrines. Atheists have just as much civil right to teach atheism as Christians have to teach Christianity; agnostics have just as much right to teach agnosticism as Christians have to teach their religion. Let it be understood that there is no attack either upon the freedom of conscience or upon any one's right to teach religion or irreligion. The real issue is whether atheists, agnostics, Darwinists and evolutionists shall enjoy *special privileges* in this country, and have rights higher than the rights of Christians. They dare not *claim* higher

rights, though they now *enjoy* higher rights and are contending for higher rights.

"When Christians want to teach Christianity, they build their own schools and colleges, and employ their own teachers—Catholics build Catholic schools, Protestants build Protestant schools. Every Protestant branch of the Christian church builds its own schools for the propagation of its own doctrine. This is the rule, and there is no protest against it.

"Why should not atheists build their own colleges and employ their own teachers if they want to teach atheism? Why should not agnostics build their own colleges and employ their own teachers if they want to teach agnosticism? Only a small percentage of the American people believe that man is descendant of the ape, monkey, or of any other form of animal life below man; why should not those who worship brute ancestors build their own colleges, and employ their own teachers for the training of their own children for their brute doctrine? There are no atheistic schools, and there are no agnostic schools—why should there be, *if atheists and agnostics can save the expense of building their own schools and the expense of employing their own teachers by using the public schools for the propagation of their doctrine? They even make their living by teaching to the children of Christians a doctrine that the parents reject and which they do not want their children to accept.* As long as the atheists and agnostics have the same rights as the Christians, what complaint can they make of injustice? Why do they ask special favors?

"If those who teach Darwinism and evolution, as applied to man, insist that they are neither agnostics

nor atheists, but are merely interpreting the Bible differently from orthodox Christians, *what right have they to ask that their interpretation be taught at public expense?* It is safe to say that not one professing Christian in ten has any sympathy with Darwinism or with any evolutionary hypothesis that takes from man the breath of the Almighty and substitutes the blood of a brute. *Why should a small fraction of the Christian church—if they call themselves Christians—insist upon propagating their views of Christianity and their interpretation of the Bible at public expense?* If any portion of the people could claim the right to teach their views at public expense, that right would certainly belong to a large majority rather than to a small minority. But the majority are not asking that their views be taught at the expense of the tax-payers; *the majority is simply protesting against the use of the public schools of a MINORITY to spread their view,* whether they be called atheists, or agnostics, or are merely teaching their interpretation of the Bible.

"Christians do not ask that the teachers in the public schools, colleges and universities become exponents of orthodox Christianity; they are not asking them to teach the Bible conception of God, to affirm the Bible's claim to infallibility, or to proclaim the deity of Christ; but Christians have a right to protest against teaching that which weakens faith in God, undermines belief in the Bible, and reduces Christ to the stature of a man. The teacher who tells the student that miracles are impossible because contrary to evolution, is attacking the Bible; what right has he to do so?

"Our schools are intended to train the minds of students, but back of the mind is the heart, out of which

'are the issues of life'. Religion deals with the Science of How to Live, which is more important than any science taught in the schools. The school teacher cannot cram enough education into the mind to offset the harm done to the student if his life is robbed of faith and his ideals are brought down to the basis of materialism. *It is high time for the people who believe in religion to make their protest against the teaching of irreligion in the public schools under the guise of science and philsophy.*

"A resolution without penalties will be sufficient—a resolution passed by the legislature declaring it unlawful for any teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee, director, member of a school board, or any other person exercising authority in or over a public school, college or university, whether holding office by election or appointment, to teach or permit to be taught in any institution of learning, supported by public taxation, atheism, agnosticism, Darwinism, or any other hypothesis that links man in blood relationship to any other form of life.

"We are not dealing with criminals, for whom fine or imprisonment is necessary, but with educated people who have substituted a scientific guess for the Bible, and who are, in the opinion of orthodox Christians, attempting to use public schools for the propagation of doctrines antagonistic to the Bible or to the interpretation of the Bible commonly accepted by professing Christians throughout the United States and the world. Fines and penalties are not only unnecessary, but would, if included in legislative measures, turn attention from the real issue which is *the protection of the rights of all in matters of conscience and religious belief.*

"The right of the tax-payers to decide what shall be taught can hardly be disputed. Someone must decide. The hand that writes the pay-check rules the school; if not, to whom shall the right to decide such important matters be intrusted?"

The issue is plain: The Evolutionists intend, through our tax-supported schools, to change our Bible and our religion. A prominent Evolutionist has put it plainly: *"We intend, first, to reconstruct Bible history in harmony with the theory of Evolution. Second, to eliminate by this process all that is supernatural in the record."* Eliminate all that is supernatural, and you have no real Redeemer left, and hell will be the home of every responsible human being. There is the issue and we need to face it. As Mr. Guizot well put it, "All those who are still Christians and believers in a supernatural life, must become united against the mission of materialistic doctrines!" And, as quoted by Pater Mundi, one of the most eminent of modern scientists said, "The evangelistic churches cannot, in consistency with their character, or with due regard to the interests of their people, slight or overlook a form of error at once exceedingly plausible and consummately dangerous and which is telling so widely on sanity that one can scarcely travel by railway or in a steamboat, or encounter a group of intelligent mechanics, without finding decided trace of its ravages."

The great Scientist, Prof. George Frederick Wright, says, "It is the fad of the present, which is making such havoc and confusion in the thought of the age, leading so many into intellectual positions, whose conclusions they dare not face and cannot flank." Exactly! But we MUST face them, or our children are doomed.

And so Prof. Geo. Howison gives the warning: "It is a portent so threatening to the highest concerns of man that we ought to look before we leap and look more than once."

"The religious public looks on with indifference while their children are being taught this doctrine, not knowing that it is a theory that undermines the Bible and all revealed religion." Alfred Fairhurst, scientist A. M. D. Sc. Theistic Evolution p. 82.

But they are raising the cry, "Science should be left to take care of itself." They said that about the liquor business: "Let liquor alone and it will let you alone." And we did until hundreds of thousands of drunkards' graves and hundreds of thousands of broken-hearted drunkards' wives, and hundreds of thousands of ragged, beggared drunkards' children, and hundreds of thousands of drunkards' souls in hell showed us that it was wrong reasoning—it did not let us alone. And they have said this about Evolution: "Let the scientists attend to their business and the preachers to theirs," and, brow-beaten by this, we have gone along until hundreds of thousands have had their faith in the Bible wrecked and their souls sent to hell, as will be shown in Chapter VII.

As President Francis L. Patton puts it, "You may put your philosophy in one pocket and your religion in another and think that, as they are separate, they will not interfere, but that will not work. You have to bring your theory of the universe and your theory of religion together."

And Alexander Patterson, the great author, well says, "To the ordinary man the matter appears in this

light: If we cannot believe a man's statements we will not take his advice. If we cannot believe the Bible's narratives, why should we believe its religion? If it is not trustworthy as to the facts of this world, why depend upon it as to the other world? If it cannot teach correctly the nature of insects and animals, why should it be able to tell us the nature of God?"

Let an Evolutionist state the case. A Theistic Evolutionist, the kind some of your Christian editors and college presidents pussy-foot about, apologize for, and defend; an honest candid one—not the Janus-faced kind that talk Evolution in a pompous know-it-all manner before college professors and students, and then go before the common people and tell tender stories of trusting the Saviour to redeem them by His blood, and whine about "the blood of Jesus" and that "Christ died for our sins"—to keep the common people hood-winked, and continue to hold their jobs! None of your Theistic Evolutionists will dare come out in the open and give a theory of Theistic Evolution that is any better than this man's statement—he is simply honest and candid. I quote from Marion D. Shutter's "Applied Evolution" as given in that book that no man will ever dare to try to answer, "Evolution—a Menace," by J. W. Porter: "Granted the greatness and goodness of Jesus, how do you account for him? What is the relation to Him of this theory of Evolution? Do you mean to include Him and His work in the general scheme? Can it be done? And the answer is: Yes; if *Evolution fails at one point it fails utterly.* We have then a case of that special intervention by a non-resident Deity, which we have repeatedly repudiated. *Evolution must include Jesus, or we must abandon the theory.* There is no break or flaw or chasm. The process is one, from fire mist to

soul; from the soul to its highest expression. *Jesus is as much the product of the laws and forces in nature and in society as Shakespeare or Napoleon.* The speaking serpent, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the tree of life, the idea that eating certain kinds of fruit would give wisdom or immortality—these are clearly legendary or mythical elements. As pictures or symbols, they may be even beautiful; but as history they are quite as far beyond the pale of fact as the fountain of youth or the dreams of alchemy. For these reasons *we cannot accept the story of Eden and the Fall as history.* There is no more testimony in its favor when it appears in Jewish or Christian writings—when it appears in Genesis and in the quotation from Genesis by Paul—than when we find it in Persian or Buddhist Scriptures. It is not the book in which we find a statement that gives it credibility; it is the character of the statement itself. . . . . And let us remember if this account of Eden and the Fall is not history, the current creeds of Christendom, not yet disavowed or revised; the theology still assumed, even where it is not directly preached—these have no footing in fact, they are but 'such stuff as dreams are made of,' they but cumber the intellectual ground of the Church and the world, and should no longer be allowed to impose upon the human understanding. . . . .

"Let us now pass on the evidence that man has risen and not fallen; that he did not begin perfect and deteriorate; but that he began low and imperfect, and has been slowly but surely gaining in character and in moral power.

"(1) First of all we have the testimony of Science. If anything is made clear by modern research and inves-

tigation it is that man was not created full-grown in body and mind, with established character; but that he came up through the animal and started on his human career with simply a few instincts inherited from the orders below and behind him. . . . . These are proofs which must stand unshaken against any legend from the dim, uncertain speculation of the world's childhood, about a creation in a moment, complete and perfect from the dust of the earth and the breath of God.

"(2) And when men came up from the animals—so far were they from being holy and righteous in character, that it took them ages upon ages to learn the difference between right and wrong, and they learned it not by direct revelation from on high, but through the experiences of their savage life, as these played upon the instinct of self-preservation and the instinct to combine with others. They learned the difference between right and wrong through animal pains and pleasures. They learned to avoid the things that hurt and do the things which brought satisfaction. They learned to live in families: they learned to live in tribes. . . . . Through these processes did man first come to morality. . . . .

"(3) The race began unenlightened, unmoral, and therefore without moral responsibility. Little by little it came on toward enlightenment, toward the appreciation of the distinction between right and wrong, and therefore toward responsibility. . . . . And for his Knowledge of God and communion with Him— the first men knew no God, but simply feared invisible beings in the natural objects about them. The idea of One Supreme, Wise, and Good Being, was the achievement of uncalandered ages. . . . . This is the account that Science gives us today; and we place it over against the

account preserved in Genesis, which the scholarship of even orthodoxy itself is resolving into the 'baseless fabric of a vision'. . . . .

(4) The earth has never been cursed; human life has never been blighted; we have never been shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin. We are under no condemnation for the sins of an ancestor who never ate the forbidden fruit. If the story of the Fall is not historic, then there is no Great Tempter, the Devil, abroad in the Universe. If there has been no fall and no devil and no wrath of God, there is no endless hell-flaming and devouring in the future; no lake of fire and brimstone that awaits us when we die. If there has been no break in the divine order, then *there is no need of atonement to restore it*—a bloody sacrifice to appease the wrath of an offended God, an innocent victim to take the place of guilty men. . . . .

"(5) There is a place for Christ; but not as the incarnate God, not as the bloody sacrifice, not as the substitute for sinners; but as the human leader and example; as the one who illustrates the victory of the spiritual over the animal; as the one who is able to teach others the secret of triumph. Is there no difference between these conceptions? . . . .

"If the genealogies given of Him in Matthew and Luke be at all correct, what blood of saints and prophets and heroes ran in His veins! The faith of Abraham, the imagination and emotion of David, the wisdom of Solomon, may have reappeared in Him—together with the gentleness and purity of Mary, his mother, and the strength and integrity of Joseph, His father. . . . . He is the child of his own immediate family, the child of His nation, the child of all the ages that went before him!

"The God of Evolution is inside of Nature and not outside of it. And when we consider that man himself is a part of Nature, and the best part of it, we must find God also in him, pre-eminently in him."

There you have Theistic Evolution stated plainly by one of its greatest advocates. Some men, to sidestep the issue, say, "I do not believe in Darwinian Evolution; I believe in Theistic Evolution." Well, there you have it. A man by the name of "Buzzard" moved from the South to a northern city and changed him name to "Bu-zard." Some years after a farmer acquaintance went to the northern city, and was introduced by a mutual friend to "Mr. Bu-zard," who said, "Mr. Smith, meet my friend Mr. Bu-zard." The southerner replied, "Buzard, nothing! I know him! He's the same old Buzzard!" Go back and read that quotation again from this great Theistic Evolutionist, and you will see that Theistic Evolution is the same old buzzard—it is feeding on the wrecked faith and doomed souls of our boys and girls in our High Schools.

Atheistic Evolution teaches that everything *did not* bring forth "after his kind." "Theistic Evolution" teaches that everything *did not* bring forth "after his kind." In both cases it means that there are ten lies in the first chapter of Genesis; that the Saviour endorsed those ten lies as the Word of God; that He is therefore not real Deity and therefore not a real Redeemer; that therefore we are left without a Redeemer, and hell only is left. Theistic Evolution will damn a student as certainly as Atheistic Evolution.

It is true that they are teaching it now in the primary departments of our public schools, as I will show in Chapter III, as well as in our State Normals and

State Universities, but the center of the curse is in our High Schools at the most dangerous, susceptible age of the students.

We are being deceived by being led to think that "Theistic Evolution" means "Christian Evolution." There is, there can be, no Christian Evolution. There is, there can be, no place in Theistic Evolution for the Saviour, except as the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman. Evolution means a continuous process; a break in the process and Evolution must be given up. Go back and read again Shutter's statement. That is what we are paying for, with our taxes, to have taught to our children in the State Universities, in the State Normals, in the High Schools, and down to the primary departments of the public schools. It is in your power to stop it through your local boards of trustees and through your legislators. Will you crouch and cower before the sneers and sarcasm of a lot of high-brows, or will you assert your Christian manhood and womanhood?

Remember that Theistic Evolution is a universal, continuous process, or it is nothing. The Bible says, "and the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore the holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God,"—Luke 1:35. Theistic Evolution says "That's a lie! that miracle did not occur; Jesus had a human father as well as mother." The Saviour said, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent me,"—John 6:38. Theistic Evolution says, "That's a lie! He never had pre-existence but had both a human mother and father."

The Saviour, after His resurrection, said to the disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day,"—Luke 24:46. Theistic Evolution says, "That's a lie. 'Evolution means a universal continuous process; Jesus was not really raised from the dead." The Bible says, "And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, 'Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven,"—Acts 2:10,11. Theistic Evolution says, "That's a lie! There was no resurrection and ascension of the Savoiur into heaven; for Evolution teaches a continuous, unbroken process."

The Saviour said, "Tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised."—Luke 7:22. Theistic Evolution says, "That's a lie; Evolution calls for a universal, unbroken, continuous process; therefore miracles do not occur."

Dr. Howard Kelly, the noted physician and scientist of Johns Hopkins, replying to an Evolutionist: "And you, dear doctor, *when you tear the first pages out of our Bible and declare them unscientific, where do you propose to end?* And can you assure me that your hearers at Crozer will halt where you choose to stop? *Do you not believe that such an unguarded wholesale declaration of belief in Evolution will inevitably also remove from your Bible the miracles, the virgin birth, Christ's atoning sacrificial death, his mighty victory over death in the resurrection of His body, and His*

ascension to the right hand of God to be our Mediator, and to prepare a place for us, and His coming again?"

The Editor of the great widely read Texas paper, The Baptist Standard, states the issue clearly: "Here is the alarming fact: *The conclusions and implications of Evolution are such that thorough-going, consistent Evolutionists cannot accept the scriptural teachings of the virgin birth, the Deity of Christ and a substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the imminent, personal return of our Lord."*

"The man who accepts it, even as a working hypothesis in teaching, will find that he has a hopeless case when he tries to adjust its claims to the teaching of Christ. He will find, also that the authors who have written the texts on the basis of Evolution repudiate all miracles."—Alfred Fairhurst, Scientist, A. M. D. Sci., Theistic Evolution, p 149.

This is Evolution; this is what is being taught in our State Universities, our State Normals, our High Schools and down to the primary departments in our public schools, and is being paid for by our taxes. Shall we stand by and see our children robbed of the Bible as God's revelation to us, robbed of a real Redeemer, and their souls sent to hell? It i s in the hands of the Christian people of this land, through their local boards of trustees, to drive every Evolutionist teacher from the High Schools and other public schools and through their legislatures to cut off all appropriations in all schools where Evolution is taught. Oh, they'll cry "Persecution!" "They burned Servetus at the stake." Well, Chapters VI and VII will show what it is doing for both teachers and students. Shall I pay a doctor to come into my home and bring health to my children,

and when I see he is poisoning them, let him continue to poison them and continue to pay him, because I am so little of soul that I am afraid of his arousing popular sympathy by crying "persecution"? His poisoning my children's bodies is nothing compared with the teachers robbing my children of a real Saviour with their Evolution and sending their souls to hell.

CHAPTER II

What Is Evolution?

EVOLUTION is not development, as the chicken from the egg, as the oak from the acorn, as the stalk from the grain of corn, as the frog from the tadpole.

Evolution is not the improvement of the species, development within the species. Everybody believes in that; that is the reason we educate our children; that is the reason we line-breed our hogs and our poultry. The man who calls these things Evolution is either a hypocrite or an ignoramus.

Evolution means that all species, from the first living cell up to man, evolved by very slight changes, through many generations for millions of years, from lower species to higher, up to man.

The man who will stand before the common people and say that he believes that God created the first man in His own image from the dust of the ground, knowing the meaning that those words have in the minds of the people, and yet mean to himself that God created him through vast millions of years by evolving him through many species from the first living cell, is as base a hypocrite as Judas Iscariot, or as ever graced a deacon's corner. Judas for his thirty pieces of silver; this man for his salary paid by the hood-winked people.

But let the Evolutionists themselves tell us what Evolution is:

"All the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial

form into which life was first breathed."—"Origin of Species" First Edition Ch. 14, p 484.

In other words, "the higher out of the lower animals, and man out of brutes;" that "all the forms of animal and vegetable life, including man himself, with all his special and distinctive faculties, have been slowly, but successively and gradually developed from the earliest and simplest organisms;" that "not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body, but the human mind itself; emotions, intellect, will, and all their phenomena * * * * * all our philosophy, all our poetry, all our science, and all our art—Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, Raphael," (Prof. Tyndall) were wrapt up in that first living cell, smaller than the point of a fine needle.

But Mr. Darwin changed this: "I believe that animals are descended from at most only four or five progenitors and plants from an equal or lesser number." —"Origin of Species" p 452.

Again: "All species of animals and plants (including man) existing today have been derived from others living in the past, by direct descent, and they will themselves give rise in the future to other still different species. The essential idea which underlies the whole theory is that species have had a natural rather than a supernatural origin."—Prof. H. W. Conn, in "Evolution of Today."

Again: "Evolution means that, whatever the ultimate origin of life, the plants and flowers and grasses and trees which clothe the earth, were not made at once, as we behold them now, but began in the simplest and fewest germs; and by gradual changes under vary-

ing conditions, attained the variety, luxuriance and beauty which wreathes the brow of the planet. It means that the members of the animal kingdom in all its departments, were not, each kind, called into being in a moment, and in fixed and definite and unvarying and unchanging species, but that the whole (animal) kingdom began countless ages ago in a shapeless mass of jelly, and has developed from one form to another up to man."—Marion D. Shutler, in "Applied Evolution."

"At first there existed on earth only a few forms of simple life similar to the amoeba, and from these acted on by the rapid changes of climate, soil, water and food, have arisen all the varied forms of animal life."—Davison's "Practical Zoology," p. 354.

Hence, "Evolution means that a single protoplasmic cell, by a process of multiplying forms through an almost infinite number of species, extending through an almost infinite number of ages, produced, with no supernatural interpositions, all the forms of life that have existed on earth."

Where did this teaching come from? Here are the facts (See "Evoution or Creation," by Townsend, pp. 72-75):

"This view of the evolutuion of things is, however, far from being a recent speculation. The old Egyptian myth that all things sprang from a mundane egg, and the teachings of the early Greek philosophers that matter originally sprang from water or from a fluid state, and that plants, animals, and worlds came from atoms which are infinitely numerous and eternal, are at least foregleams of all that has been claimed for Eovlution in these later years.

"Professor Tyndall frankly acknowledged that he finds the atomic philosophy and the survival of the fittest in Democritus. Aristotle likewise was an experimenter in these same fields. Lucretius was a clearly pronounced Eovlutionist. The Arabian scientists most emphatically taught the evolution of the universe from atoms and germs. Dismissing from the universe a personal Creator, Epicurus placed back of his scheme of Evolution what may be called spontaneous chance. Evolution as a method was almost as explicitly set forth by St. Augustine as by Charles Darwin. Giordano Bruno, in 1580, read papers before the most cultivated people of his times on Evolution and spontaneous generation. About the same time Francisco Saurez adopted and greatly extended the evolution views of Augustine, and made such application of them as to deprive modern thinkers of their claim to originality. In 1640 Professor Pierre Gassendi, though not rejecting the superintendence of an infinite intelligence, defended the doctrine of development from atoms. In 1748 De Maillet advanced the theory that plants and animals are spontaneously modified forms of nature. Comte De Buffon, about 1780, announced the theory of transmutation of species. Lord Monboddo, in 1778, suggested the possible origin of man from the ape. Jean Baptiste Lamarck, a distinguished French naturalist, proposed, in 1809, the hypothesis of the elevation of an animal 'to a higher range of faculties and appropriate organs by the prolonged and repeated efforts made by it to obtain to conditions and advantages just within or at first just beyond its reach.' Erasmus Darwin, as early as 1795, published views that contain the fundamental principles of the most pronounced Darwinism of the

present time. Dr. W. C. Wells, in 1813, used the term 'Natural selection' and applied it to the development of man. Professor William Herbert, in 1822, published the theory of the 'transmutation of species in plants,' and about the same time Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire announced the hypothesis of 'transmutation in the animal kingdom.' Hugo von Mohl and Max Schultze, in 1850 or a trifle later, spoke of a protoplasmic material or substance from which all things originate. Herbert Spencer, nearly fifty years ago, connected the theory of development with both cosmology and biology. Dr. Alfred R. Wallace and Charles Darwin, in 1858, separately announced the hypothesis of the 'origin of the species by spontaneous variation, and the survival of the fittest through natural selection and the struggle for existence.'"

"Such is the history of Evolution down to the time of its announcement by Dr. Wallace and Mr. Darwin. So far from being something new, it would better be regarded a revival and enlargement of views, entertained by philosophers and church fathers, skeptics and scientists, during the last twenty centuries."

How did the first protoplasmic cell, the first living thing above the non-living, come into existence? They have had four theories:

First, "spontaneous generation," that when there was no life on the earth chemical combinations were formed that produced the first life, the first living thing. Hear a Professor of Chicago University, that slaughter-house of faith, where they do as the old negro preacher said he was going to do, "Bredderin and sisterin, tonight I'se gwine to dispense wid the gospil and confound de scriptures"—is reported from his lec-

ture room to have said, "The Divine creation of life is a pure humbug. Life originally happened. Life is made up of certain organic compounds; certain organic compounds were made by nature. The compounds came together in some manner and the result was life."

But listen to the scientists:

"I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental evidence exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independent of antecedent life."—Prof. Tyndall, in "The Nineteenth Century."

"Dead matter cannot become living without coming under the influence of matter perviously alive. This seems to me as sure a teaching of science as the law of gravitation."—Sir Wm. Thomson.

Prof. Huxley brought out the theory that the constant lashing of the ocean against its bed in some way pounded dead matter into life. But he confessed his mistake in the article on "Biology" in the Encyclopedia Brittanica, Ninth London Edition, he says, "At the present moment there is not a shadow of trustworthy evidence that abiogenesis (spontaneous generation) does take place, or has taken place, within the period during which life on the globe is recorded. . . . Of the causes that have led to the origination of living matter, then, it may be said we know absolutely nothing."

Louis Pasteur, the great Catholic scientist of France, by thorough exhaustive experiments, forever crushed the teaching of spontaneous generation. In his lecture in Paris where he gave the results of his experiments before the most atheistic body of scientists in the world, with all the great scientists of that country present, he said: "There is no circumstance known at

the present day which justifies the assertion that microscopic organism came into the world without germs, or without parents like themselves. Those who maintain the contrary have been the dupes of illusions and of ill-conducted experiments tainted with errors which they know not how to avoid." Then the permanent secretary of the French Academy of Science, Mr. Flourens, a scientist of note, pronounced these words before the whole Academy: "As long as my opinion was not formed I had nothing to say. Now it is, and I can speak. The experiments are decisive. If spontaneous generation be a fact, what is necessary for the production of germs? Air and fermentable liquids. Now Pasteur puts together air and fermentable liquids and nothing is produced. Spontaneous generation has no existence. Those who still doubt have failed to grasp the question."—Life of Pasteur, p. 109.

Second, that the first living germ came to our earth from some other planet, possibly on a meteorite. Isn't that science! An old negro in the South, preaching on the Creation of man, said, "My brudderin, when God made de fust man, he made him out o' mud and leant him up agin de fence ter dry!" An old negro in the audience said, "Who made dat fence, brudder?" The nonplussed preached scratched his head a moment and said, "Dem kind o' questions will spile all de theology in dis worl'!" One question, if the first protoplasmic cell, the first living thing on this earth, came here from some other planet, on a meteorite or otherwise, how did the first one get to that other planet? How did the first of all the living cells of the universe come into existence? *You cannot get rid of God!* AMEN

The third theory is that God brought that first living cell, the first living thing above the non-living,

into existence and endowed it with all the capabilities of evolving through millions of generations, through millions of ages, from lower species to higher up to and including man.

The fourth theory is that God created the first tiny living cell, and has, down through the millions of years, actively directed its evolution from generation to generation through millions of generations up through all the species up to and including man.

It is claimed that these last two theories make God as great and as wise and as all-powerful as the Bible account of creation. Granted: but that Bible account says ten times that everything brought forth "after his kind" and Evolution says these are ten lies, that everything did not bring forth "after his kind." The Bible account says that God created man in His own image; Evolution says that that is another lie; that the first man was midway between the anthropoid ape and modern man. The Bible account says that the first man spoke a plain language. Evolution says that that is another lie, that the first man did not have a plain language, but only exclamations of pain and pleasure, as animals in trees. Now the Saviour endorsed Genesis as the word of God. Any schoolboy knows that Deity would not endorse these twelve lies as the word of God. If, then, Evolution is true, and the High School books and teachers say that it is true, then the Saviour was not real Deity; then we have no real Redeemer, and only hell is left as the eternal home of all responsible human beings. That is the issue.

Prof. Tyndall before an audience said: "If to any one of us were given the privilege of looking back through the aeons across which life has crept towards

its present outcome, his vision would ultimately reach a point where the progenitors of this assembly could not be called human. From that humble society through the interaction of its members and the storing up of their best qualities, a better one emerged; from this again a better stil; until at length by the intergration of infinitesimals through ages of amelioration, we come to be what we are today." Every Evolutionist believes that; and no honest man can believe that and believe the Bible to be the word of God.

Hence, Prof. Huxely said, "Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible."

E. G. Conklin, Professor of Biology in Princeton University, in "The Direction of Human Evolution," p. 176: "From primitive protoplasm has developed all the multitudes of living things which inhabit the globe, including man, the paragon of animals, the climax of Evolution."

E. G. Conklin again, p. 176: "From the primitive faith of the child or the savage has developed the highest type of religion and ethics that the world has ever known. . . . The mystery of mysteries is how the egg cell or the original protoplasm or savage society, or primitive religion came to contain all the marvelous potencies of development which they possess."

It is no wonder that Wm. Jennings Bryan questions: "Is it conceivable that the hawk and the humming bird, the spider and the honey bee, the turkey gobbler and the mocking bird, the butterfly and the eagle, the ostrich and the wren, the tree toad and the elephant, the giraffe and the kangaroo, the wolf and

the lamb should all be the descendants of a common ancestor?"

Some of Napoleon's officers were airing their skeptical views and Napoleon said, "It seems to me that you make amends for not believing the Bible by believing everything else."

Mr. Bryan, in exposing the dangerous teachings in the University of Wisconsin, charging that Pres. E. A. Birge was fostering the teaching of Atheism and ridiculing the belief in God and the divinity of Jesus Christ, said, "I think the mothers and fathers and the grandmothers and grandfathers who believe in God and believe that Jesus Christ was more than an unusual man and a child of disgrace, ought to know what the President of the University is teaching and fostering."

According to the Associated Press, President Birge's reply was, "Bryan is crazy; he is seeking notoriety and I refuse to engage in a newspaper argument with him (wise, discreet man!—T. T. M.). No one pays any attention to what Bryan says, anyhow." He'll see!

When Bryan speaks on Evolution why do "the demi-gods of the scientific Olympus forsake their philosophic calm for the irritating gusto of irascible acerbity?" Why? "There's a reason."

E. G. Conklin says, p. 4: "There is no longer any doubt among scientists that man descended from animal ancestors." We shall see about that in Chapter V.

The issue is plain; as sure as Evolution is taught in our schools, many will believe it. As sure as they do, they, if consistent, cannot believe the Bible and will go to hell. Your half-baked, pseudo-scientists will sneer at this, but they will never answer it.

CHAPTER III

What Is Being Taught in Our Schools?

THE cry is raised, "Why disturb the common people about this? They don't know about Evolution; they cannot understand it." They can't? The Evolutionists do use high-sounding big words apparently to befog the people, and keep them in the dark. Philip Mauro, the New York lawyer, puts it pungently: "The exponents of science and philosophy usually adopt a style and vocabulary which effectually hide their meaning from 'the common people,' and which are well calculated to produce the impression that the subjects they discuss are too mysterious and profound to be understood by any but the few who (like themselves) are gifted with intellects of a superior order and possessed of knowledge unattainable by the ordinary man." Here is a sample: Herbert Spencer tells us what Evolution is:

"Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from a relatively indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a relatively definite coherent heterogeneity and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."

Take as another example: their word for long-headedness is "dolicocephaly," and their word for round-headedness is "brachy-cephaly"!

No wonder "the common people" think that they cannot understand the thing!

And yet while the pussy-footing apologists for the Evolutionists are raising such a hue and cry that we

who are trying to protect the people cannot understand Evolution, and that the "common people" ought not to be disturbed, that they cannot understand Evolution, the Evolutionists are making it plain to our children, even in the public schools, and are filling their minds with it and damning their souls.

Here are two simple lessons taught the little tots in the Primary Department—not in the State Universities, mind you—that is bad enough to poison and damn our young men and women, taking advantage of them at the age when they are romantic and easily take to things that are new and startling and out of the ordinary, at the age when they are skeptical and wish to throw off restraint and not be considered "old fogey," but "up-to-date"—to take them at that age, and under the cloak of a learned, dignified Professor lie to them (that is strong language, but see if I do not make good in Chapter V) and say that "all scientists now believe in Evolution"—that is bad enough; but stealthily, like the slimy copper-head moccasin, not like the rattler that at least gives warning of its poison, sting with their deadly, damning poison the little trusting child in the Primary Department. You know the trusting heart of the child in the Primary Department, how it thinks that what the teacher says is so! and it sinks into the little soul that what is in its books is so! and it goes into its soul. Listen to these two lessons:

From "Home Primary Geography," by Harold W. Fairbanks, Revised Edition, published by the Educational Publishing Company, p. 124:

"Seals and whales are among the most interesting of the ocean animals. They are not fish, for they have to come to the surface to breathe air. What a strange

story these animals can tell! Their grandfathers lived upon the land ever so long ago. (There is not one particle of proof of this, simply a wild, hair-brained theory.—T. T. M.) They had four legs and walked around like other animals (No particle of proof for this.— T. T. M.). They used to go into the water for food (no particle of proof for this.—T. T. M.) and at last spent the most of their time there. Their bodies and legs became changed (no particle of proof for this. —T. T. M.) so that they could swim or paddle through the water. Now they are at home in the water, and very quick and graceful in their movements." Now this is put in the book for the primary department as actual truth and fact, and is taugh to the trusting, unsuspecting child. Then the child hears the preacher read, "And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, "*after their kind,*" and the thought comes, "the Bible does not tell the truth; for my book in school says that whales were once animals on the land and had four legs and walked around on the land; and my teacher says it, too. The Bible does not tell the truth." Then the child hears the preacher read that Jesus said the Scriptures are true, are the word of God, and it says: "Jesus does not tell the truth; for my book in school says that the Bible does not tell the truth, for it says that whales were once animals on the land and had four legs; and my teacher says it is so." And the faith in the Bible as God's word and in the Saviour as God's Son is gone. It does not dare tell its father and mother so, but its soul is wrecked.

But further, from the same book, p. 143: "If birds could talk, what stories we might hear. We might learn of a time, ever so long ago, when their grand-

fathers were not birds at all (not one particle of proof for this; simply a wild, hair-brained theory.—T .T. M.). Then they could not fly, for they had neither wings nor feathers (not one particle of proof for this. —T. T. M.). These grandfathers of our birds had four legs (not one particle of proof for this.—T. T. M.) a long tail and jaws with teeth (not one particle of proof for this.—T. T. M.). After a time feathers grew upon their bodies, and their four legs became changed for flying. These were strange looking creatures. There are none living like them now." The simple, trusting child reads this; the teacher, trained in the State University or State Normal, backs it up and teaches it; the child hears the Pastor read: "And God created great whales and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly *after their kind*, and every winged fowl *after his kind*" (Gen. 1:21), and the child says: "That is not so, because my school book and my teacher say that whales grew from animals with four legs and birds grew from animals with four legs; the Bible does not tell the truth!" Then the child hears the pastor read that the Scriptures are God's word, and the child says: "That's not so, for God's word would tell the truth, and that Bible does not tell the truth about whales and birds; and if Jesus had been God's Son he would not have said that the Bible that does not tell the truth is God's word." And those children go out into Eternity without a real Redeemer. And their fathers and mothers pay the taxes for this teaching and stand by and see their children damned.

The Germans poisoned the wells of Belgium and Northern France, that the children who came to drink might be poisoned and die. They were angels, compared to the men who put such poison as this in the

wells and springs from which our children come to drink a little learning.

The Germans filled aeroplanes with poisoned candy and flew over Belgium and Northern France and poured it out that the poor starving Belgian and French children might eat it and die—they were angels, compared to those who, paid by our taxes, stand as teachers and feed such poison to our children.

A German officer, a physician, was quartered in a French home, the husband being away in the army. The night the little French woman was to become a mother, the German officer agreed to wait upon her as her physician. The next morning as the little French mother, in the gray dawn, came to consciousness with her wee babe lying by her side, she began pouring out her heart's gratitude to the German officer, and said she could never repay him. The heartless German said that he was already repaid; and the little French mother asked how? The German said that he put out the babe's eyes when it was born and that it would never aim a gun at a German. He was an angel compared to these who blind the souls of our children and send them into outer darkness for Eternity while they are being fed from our hands by our taxes, these Christianity sucked soul-murderers. And we stand by in indifference!

From an other school book: "His (man's) structure indicates descent from ancestors of ape-like habits, living in trees and on fruits."—High School Geography, by Charles R. Dryer, p. 255, published by the American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, Boston and Atlanta.

At once the High School boys and girls, on seeing that, see that if that is true (and to them, of course, it

is true because it is taught in their school book, and the teacher teaches it) the Bible is a lie and Jesus was not Deity at all, or he would not have endorsed the lie as the word of God.

Edward's Sociology, p. 33: "Thus we cannot except even man from the theory of Evolution, and suppose that he was especially created."

"Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the old world."—"Descent of Man," Vol. 2, p. 389.

"The early progenitors of man were no doubt well covered with hair, both sexes having beards; their ears were pointed and capable of movement; and their bodies were provided with a tail having the proper muscles."—"Descent of Man," Vol. 1, p. 206.

From "Principles of Botany," by Bergen and Davis. Ginn & Co.:

"In the times of Linnaeus, who lived in the eighteenth century, almost all naturalists believed that the species or kinds of animals and plants had never changed in their characters during their long history on the earth. They believed that new kinds could only arise by special acts of creation. This doctrine of special creation gave way to the present belief in organic evolution." (p. 153.)

"It seems clear that sex arose with the development of a type of zoospore smaller and apparently weaker in its power of vegetative growth than the normal zoosport." (p. 223.)

"The origin of the bryophytes is a mystery. They have, of course, arisen from the algae, but there are no

living algae that resemble the bryophytes at all closely." (p. 302.)

"The pteriodophytes undoubtedly arose from a bryophyte ancestry." (p. 342.)

"We shall never know exactly when and how seed plants arose, for that important event in plant evolution probably took place earlier than the Carboniferous Age. We can, however, form some idea of the chief factors that brought about the seed habit." (p. 389.)

"It is easy to understand *why* a good many kinds of plants *have taken to* catching insects and absorbing the digested products. Carniverous, or flesh-eating, plants belong usually to one of two classes as regards their place of growth; they are either bog plans or air plants. In either case their roots find it difficult to find much nitrogen-containing food—that is, much food out of which proteid material can be built up. Animal food, being itself largely proteid, is admirably adapted to nourish the growing parts of plants, and those which could *develop* insect-catching powers would stand a far better chance to exist as air plants or in the thin, watery soil of bogs than plants which had *acquired* no such resources." (p. 412.)

Reader, for the top of tom-foolery, commend me to this. Consider: First, that these plants had intelligence to realize that they needed proteids; second, that they had knowledge of the chemical composition of the bodies of insects, that these bodies of insects contained the proteids that they themselves needed (what wonderful chemists away back there in the beginning of time, these bog and air plants were!); third, that they had intelligence to plan schemes for catching insects;

fourth, that they had power to invent and construct insect-catching mechanisms; fifth, that they had the omnipotent power of carrying these proteids into their own systems and digesting them, and then of carrying the proteids to the different parts of their bodies. Can't you see, reader, that these men make veritable gods out of these bog and air plants. Yet this is done throughout their book. But the deadly danger of it—it brands Genesis as a lie and, the Saviour having endorsed Genesis, it brands Him as a liar, and, therefore, not Deity but as the bastard illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and leaves your sons and daughters who believe this book, without any Saviour at all, and, hence the final result of the teaching of this book is simply *Hell* for your children.

"How Plants *Protect Themselves* from Animals." (p. 413.)

Notice, reader, first, that these plants have knowledge that they need protection; second, that they have reason to plan protection; third, that they have the ability of God to provide the protection, and this is being taught to your children as "science."

Again: "There are plenty of instances of structures, habits, or accumulations of stored material in their tissue which plants seem to *have acquired* mainly or entirely as *means of defense.* Some of the most important are: 1. The habit of keeping a bodyguard of ants. 2. Forming tough, corky, woody, limy, or flinty, and therefore nearly uneatable, tissue. 3. Arming exposed parts with cutting edges, sharp or stinging hairs, prickles or thorns. 4. Accumulating unpleasant or poisonous substances in exposed parts." (pp. 413, 414.)

Reader, will you consider: God did not do these things, for that would mean design in creation, and it is beneath the dignity of these high-brow pseudo-scientists to admit such a thing, and would lead your boys and girls to believing in God and in the Bible, and in Jesus Christ as a Saviour, and would leave these hell-agents out of a job, and prevent them being looked upon as learned, and as being above the common herd who believe in a Creator and a real hell and a Redeemer. Get it: these plants "*protect themselves* from animals." God didn't design it, God didn't do it; that these things, these plants "*have acquired* mainly or entirely as *means of defense.*" Consider these things: First, keeping a bodyguard of ants. There are plants, such as a species of Acacia which have thorns in which ants live, and these plants have little growths at the ends of the leaflets which the ants use as food. Now these pseudo-scientists say that these plants, *to protect themselves from being eaten by animals,* planned to grow these thorns, to have ants live in them, and to grow these tender growths for the food of the ants, in order to keep the ants as a bodyguard, and this is rammed down the throats of your children, in the name of Science, and you pay the taxes to have it done. Consider, —first, these plants have intelligence, and feeling, and dread to be eaten by animals; second—they have knowledge, that ants will make a bodyguard; third—they have knowledge of the fact that an animal chewing ants would get a bad stinging taste in their mouths, and yet these little plants have never chewed an ant or eaten one; fourth—they have knowledge of the fact that the ant can sting and inject a poison, and yet they have never been stung nor poisoned by an ant; fifth—they have knowledge of what kind of little growths

would be suitable as food for ants; sixth—they had the intelligence to know how to grow out these little growths for the ants (what chemists they were!); seventh—they had the omnipotence to grow these new growths, and to grow these thorns, in which the ants should make their home. Can't you see, reader, that these pseudo-scientists simply have a multitude of little gods, hence are really polytheists and, inevitably, will lead your children in the same direction, and to reject Jesus Christ as a Saviour, and hence to spend eternity in hell? And yet, these pseudo-scientists can not believe in a real God with real design and in the Bible and in Jesus Christ as a Saviour!

Second—"Forming tough, corky, limy, or flinty therefore nearly uneatable tissue," that such plants as the horse-tail, to prevent being eaten by animals, planned to grow an outer coating composed of deposits of silica and other uneatable substances, to protect themselves; that such plants as the tough rushes, chaparral, etc., planned to grow their coating to protect themselves from being eaten by animals!

Third—"Arming exposed parts with cutting edges, sharp or stinging hairs, prickles or thorns." Get it, reader, that these once tender plants had intelligence and feeling and dreaded to be eaten and so, "*have acquired*" to "*protect themselves from animals* cutting edges, sharp or stinging hairs, prickles or thorns," such as the barberry, night shade, locust, nettle, etc. Why didn't the oaks, and timothy, and clover and bluegrass have that much sense, and ability to grow thorns and stinging hairs and saw-edges, and barbed margins to protect themselves? Consider, reader: these once tender, delicate plants had feelings and intelligence; they

dreaded to be eaten; they had intelligence to know that animals had feelings, that they could suffer, that a thorn, or stinging hair, could produce the suffering; they had the omnipotent power, to plan and grow these thorns and stinging hairs; they had the omnipotent power and the chemical knowledge, to put into some of these stinging hairs a poison. What wonderful intelligence! What wonderful design! What wonderful ability! And yet your sons and daughters are taught this in the name of science, rather than to allow them to believe in a God of design, who has laws, who will punish the violation of those laws in hell; and yet, who, in pure love and mercy has provided a Redeemer in the person of His own Son, who died for our sins. And yet you, reader, pay the taxes, to thus have your own children sent to hell. Yet this book, and others like it, are taught in Baptist, Catholic, Congregational, Disciple, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian and other religious colleges, with the tacit endorsement of their Presidents and Boards of Trustees. And if anyone dare protest the only answer they have is "They burned Servetus at the stake"!! And then the denominaional cat-o-nine-tails is laid on the quivering back of the one who dares protest, while our sons and daughters are being sent to hell in the name of religion by these pseudo-scientists.

Fourth—"Accumulating unpleasant or poisonous substances in exposed parts." Understand, reader, tender plants, with feelings and intelligence, dreading to be eaten by animals, *"have acquired"* to *"protect themselves from animals,* unpleasant or poisonous substances in exposed parts." Bergen and Davis' own illustrations are the dog fennel, the hound's tongue, the jimson weed (they certainly did a good job there), the

tomato plant, the poisonous hemlock, red peppers, horse radish, etc. Consider, patient reader, that these tender plants had feelings, had intelligence, had design, had wonderful chemical knowledge, had power and ability to carry those designs into execution. What splendid smelling ability they had! They knew that animals did not like certain smells; they knew how the dog fennel would smell, and that animals would not like it; they knew how the jimson weed would smell; they knew how red pepper would taste to an animal; they knew how horse-radish would taste to an animal; they knew the marvelous chemical combination to produce the dog fennel smell; they knew the marvelous chemical combination to produce the jimson weed smell; they knew the marvelous and varied chemical combinations to produce the worm-wood taste, the red pepper taste, the horse-radish taste, and, *mirabile dictu!* they had the ability to produce all these chemical combinations and to grow them! And yet, these intellectual high-brows, these pseudo-scientists, can not believe in a real God of design, that He has laws, that the violation of those laws will be punished, and that in love and mercy and righteously, He has provided a real Redeemer, to protect and save those who have violated those laws. And these public school teachers who teach this, and these denominational colleges who teach it, with their presidents and Boards of Trustees, pretend that they haven't sense enough to see that this teaching absolutely contradicts the teaching of Genesis, and that, the Saviour having endorsed Genesis, it makes Him no longer Deity, but the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and therefore no Redeemer at all, but leaves our sons and daughters to go to hell.

"Many insects depend mainly or wholly upon the nectar and the pollen of flowers for their food. Such insects usually visit during any given trip only one kind of flower, and therefore carry but one kind of pollen. Going straight from one flower to another with this, they evidently waste far less pollen than the wind and water must waste. It is therefore clearly advantageous to flowers *to develop* such adaptations as fit them *to attract insect visitors,* and *to give pollen to the latter* and receive it from them." (p 422.) Were this given as God's design, how wonderful!, how sublime! But no, reader, the flower without eyes or ears, knows that these insects on any given trip go only to one kind of flower; they know that these insects take pollen from one flower and give it to another flower; they know what kind of color, what kind of smell or odor will attract these insect visitors, they have the chemical knowledge and omnipotent ability to make such chemical combinations as *"to develop such adaptations!"* Can't you see that these books being taught to our boys and girls in the high schools, written by polytheistic-pantheists and taught by teachers who are paid by our taxes and tacitly endorsed by the presidents and boards of trustees of some of our religious colleges, simply make gods out of flowers, dethrone the God of creation, make Genesis a book of lies, and the Saviour who endorsed it the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, leaves the world in sin without a Redeemer, and our boys and girls to die in their sins and go to hell?

"Regular flowers with radical symmetry usually have no special adaptations to make them singly accessible to insects, but lie open to all comers. They do, however, *Make themselves much more attractive* and

afford especial inducements in the matter of saving time to flower-frequenting insects by *being grouped.* This *purpose* is undoubtedly *served* by dense flower clusters." (p 425.) (Italics mine.—T. T. M.)

Will you notice, reader, that the teaching here is that the flowers *"make themselves much more attractive;"* that they *"afford especial inducements in the matter of saving time to flower-frequenting insects by being grouped?"* Do you notice that this *"purpose"* of the flowers is *"undoubtedly served by dense flower clusters?"* Consider—These flowers have intelligence; they know that insects admire attractive flowers; they are as scheming as twentieth century flapper girls—they *"make themselves much more attractive;"* they are even superior to the flapper girl, for the flowers succeed, and the twenieth century flapper girl makes a dismal failure; they know how to make themselves attractive, and they have omnipotent ability to make such chemical combinations as will produce this attractiveness; they have all the far-sightedness and scheming of the head of a great twentieth century corporation; for they see that by *"being grouped"* into *"dense flower clusters"* they *"afford especial inducements in the matter of saving time to flower-frequenting insects!"* And they have the design and the ability to carry this plan all into effect! Reader, this is not a nursery tale; this is palmed off on your sons and daughters as real *science,* and you pay your hard-earned money in taxes or to your religious schools to have this taught to your boys and girls and damn their souls! For it does away with a God of design and makes gods out of flowers, and brands the Saviour who endorsed Genesis, as, not God's Son, but the bastard, illegitimate

son of a fallen woman, and leaves the world without a real Redeemer—then only hell is left.

"The practice of shedding the leaves before the arrival of severe freezing weather, when it becomes almost impossible to draw moisture from the earth, or before the culmination of the severest drought of summer, may be regarded as a *habit gradually acquired* by decidous trees and shrubs *for their own protection.*" (pp 467, 468.)

Reader, these pseudo-scientists et id omne genus, and their willing tools, or dupes, in the form of your public school teachers and some professors in religious schools, who are backed by your boards of trustees, cannot believe in a God of design, and laugh at the argument from design, as being out of date, a back-number, and yet they give to these trees the intelligence and the omniscience of almighty God; and yet you tax payers, who could have every one of these books removed from the schools as well as every one of your public school teachers who are aping these authors and trying to appear learned, who are joining hands with these men, these pseudo-scientists, to throw your Bibles on the scrap-heap, and do away with the Saviour as the Redeemer of your children, drift on in careless indifference while your children are being robbed of their Saviour and sent to hell, or bow as abject slaves before these high-brows who live off of your money and then damn your children's souls; and you Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians and others, cringe like slaves before your denominational cat-o-nine-tails and don't dare protest lest you be scourged to bleeding by some of your denominational leaders, and, like dumb-driven

cattle, go on producing the means to support these professors who are thus damning and dooming your children. In the name of God, where is your Christian manhood? Where is the spirit of those who came over in the Mayflower? Where is the Spirit of 1776? The rule of England over the colonies was child's play, compared to this God-dishonoring, God-defying, Christ-dethroning, Saviour-destroying, soul-dooming curse of Evolution that now has us by the throat. *"How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him, but if Baal, then follow him." "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?"*

Be it said to the credit of the Catholics that they are at least making some fight against this terrible curse of infidelity under the guise of Evolution, that, with all the slickness of the slimy serpent, has crept into our public schools and is nestling in the bosom of our denominational colleges.

To all this, reader, they do not dare try honestly to reply. They have just two replies: First—"They burned Servetus at the stake!" Second—They will play the sissy and say we believe in *Theistic* Evolution. There isn't a Theistic Evolutionist on this earth that can reconcile his Theistic Evolution *with the ten-times-repeated statement in Genesis that "Everything brought forth after his kind," nor can they reconsile these statements with the Saviour's endorsing Genesis as the Word of God, nor can they reconcile the Saviour's endorsing these statements as endorsing Genesis as the Word of God, nor can they reconcile the Saviour's endorsing these statements as the Word of God with His Deity. If they can, why don't they do it? To drill into our young people in public*

schools and colleges that Evolution is true, means, inevitably, for those who think honestly, to give up the Bible as really God's Word and Jesus Christ as being Deity, and to leave our young people, therefore, without a Redeemer, and to spend Eternity in hell.

The difference between Atheistic Evolution and THEISTIC Evolution is simply that Atheistic Evolution teaches that the first protoplasm came into existence by chemical combinations; and Theistic Evolution teaches that God created the first amoeba and put within that first amoeba all the abilities, the potentialities, to evolve from one species to another up to man, or that God having created the first amoeba constantly worked through Evolution to evolve from that amoeba all species up to man. One is just as much Bible-denying, Christ-dethroning, and soul-destroying as the other. Scratch under he skin and you will find that the Theistic Evolutionists no more believes in the Bible's hell than the Atheistic Evolutionist, and, could the reader look in on every one of them as he reads this book, he would see a suppressed sneer at every reference to Evolution in our schools as sending our boys and girls to hell; and yet, not one of them will come out in the open and even attempt to reconcile his Theistic Evolution with Genesis, saying that everything brought forth after his kind, and with our Saviour endorsing Genesis as the Word of God, and with the Deity of our Saviour. An Irishman came over to this country and got stung by a yellow-jacket. Some days afterwards a hornet came flying around Pat and old Pat said, "And now, faith, you go on away from here. You've changed your coat, but I know your voice." There is as deadly a sting for the human soul in Theistic Evolution as was ever in Atheistic Evolution.

When this great issue is on that goes to the bottom of the question of the eternal destiny of human souls, hell is almost too good for the whining hypocrite in pulpit or school room who will talk about Evolution and make it mean simply the development of the embryo into the full grown species, as the development of the full grown stalk of corn from the grain, through the blade up to the full grown ear and stalk, or as the development of the egg into the chicken, or who will talk of the improvement of the species as Evolution. If that is Evolution, why all this parading of Evolutionists as being learned? Every old farmer believes in the development of a stalk of corn from a grain of corn, of the development of the egg into the full grown chicken; every one of them believes in the improvement of the species. No, reader, that is not Evolution, AND THE LAST ONE OF THEM KNOWS IT, and they stoop to this miserable, hypocritical camouflaging in order to save their faces and continue to be supported by our taxes, or the hard-earned money of Christian people in our religious colleges; or others stoop to this miserable, hypocritical camouflaging, in order to protect these pseudo-scientists from the wrath of the people and help keep them in their positions .

Here are further samples:

"For example, in the course of ages it became conventional for civilized people to wear clothes which on most occasions cover most of the body." . . . Blackmar and Gillin, *Outlines of Sociology*, p 229, quoted in *Principles of Sociology With Educational Applications.* by Frederick Clow, p 136.

"Man began his career as a brute; he may end it as a moron." *Principles of Sociology WithEducational Applications.* (Clow, p 296.)

"It was so, even when our anthropoid ancestors rose to the erect position; that was 'progress' and it gained us the use of hands. But it lost us our tails, and much else that is more regrettable than we are always able to realize." Ellis, *Task of Social Hygiene,* pp 7, 8, quoted in Clow's *Principles of Sociology With Educational Applications,* p 396.

"Instincts are built up by evolution in the race and transmitted to the individual by inheritance." . . . . (*Human Psychology,* by Howard C. Warren, p 27.)

"While the presence of consciousness in sub-human animals is not demonstrated, the evidence indicates that the mental life of man is merely a higher or more complex form of the same sort of phenomena which appear in lower species. The evolution process is gradual, and starts at least with the protozoa." (*Human Psychology,* by Howard C. Warren, p 218.)

"Moreover, there are forces in the environment for the reception of which no special organ has evolved." (*Human Psychology,* Warren, p 218.)

"The emotions, more than any other kind of mental states, represent by-gone conditions of life. Many of them may be regarded as fossil remains of our prehuman ancestors." (*Human Psychology.* Warren, p 300.)

Evolution makes a god out of nature; hence it is really "scholastic paganism." Notice:

Prof. S. C. Schmucker, Ph. D., Professor of Biological Sciences in the West Chester State Normal School, West Chester, Pa., in "The Meaning of Evolution" (pp. 104, 105): "Accordingly nature has concocted many devices by which she assists her favored

children in escaping this relentless persecution." Notice, reader, not that God has designed these plans for protection for His creatures, but "Nature has concocted many devices by which she assists her favored children." "Nature" has intelligence; "Nature" knows "her favored children are persecuted"; "Nature" has feeling for her persecuted children and desires to protect them; "Nature" has wisdom to know what devices will protect; "Nature" has power, ability to concoct "many devices." This is making a Deity out of Nature. And this professor trains teachers to go out and teach our children and with Evolution destroy their faith in the Bible as God's word, in the Saviour as real Deity and in Him as real Redeemer.

Again, from the same author, pp. 116, 117: "Nature is very versatile. So many of her apparently chance ventures have proved successful that she has retained many devices by which her children may be safe." Here again "nature" has intelligence, and has "retained many devices" "by which her children may be safe," and makes "ventures"; but she hasn't as much sense as before, for many of her "ventures" are "apparently chance ventures"—she doesn't know just the thing that ought to be done!

Again, same author, p. 120: "Under conditions like these nature is more than commonly careful of her children." "Nature" again has intelligence and has concern," more than commonly careful," for her children.

Again, same author, p. 124: "These are only a few of the numberless devices Nature has evolved for fostering the success of her children." Here again the Evolutionist makes a god out of "nature." "Nature"

has intelligence; knows the need of "numberless devices"; has wisdom and ability to plan and to execute these "devices" and "numberless" ones, a God-work; knows what "success" of her children is and desires it and plans for it.

Again, same author, p. 126: "Nature is full of devices by which those who have proved their original endowment by winning out in the sruggle shall hand on this endowment to a subsequent generation. In other words, Nature is anxious that they may successfully mate."

Notice, reader, "Nature is full of devices"; yet this Evolutionist cannot believe in a *God of design*—no, no, that would be "orthodox," "old-fashioned," not "up-to-date," not "scientific"; "Nature is anxious"—has plans, desires, yearnings, has intelligence, then—"that they may successfully mate." Well, God said, "Be fruitful and multiply." But that is not "scientific"; that is not "up-to-date"; that is "old traditions." Evolution says that "Nature is anxious that they may successfully mate." They make a god out of "nature" and that is—*heathenism!* And this and other Evolutionists thus train the teachers in the Normal Schools to go out and teach this to your boys and girls and destroy their faith in the Bible as God's word and the Saviour as Redeemer and wreck their souls and send them to hell, and your taxes pay for it to be done.

That is Evolution. Now listen:

Pres. W. H. P. Faunce of Brown University:

"Probably every teacher of physical science in every college and high school in the Northern States agrees with this declaration of the American Associa-

tion for the Advancement of Science—undeviating belief in Evolution as the method by which the world as we know it acquired its present form. *Every boy or girl attending High School north of Mason and Dixon's line is now being taught some form of the doctrine of Evolution.*"

The Editor of the Baptist Standard of Texas, who quotes Pres. Faunce, adds: "Unwittingly Pres. Faunce pays a high compliment to the South. Let this statement, whether or not he has been misinformed, be a warning to our people in the South. *Let us keep this heresy out of our schools.*"

Prof. E. G. Conklin of Princeton University, in "The Direction of Human Evolution," p. 14:

"His actual origin goes back, not to Adam and Eve and the Garden of Eden, 6,000 years ago, but to more primitive races of men, and then to pre-human ancestors, and in the end to the earliest forms of life upon the earth. Between us and these earliest forms there has been an unbroken line of descent."

H. G. Wells' "Outline of History" speaks on p. 57 of an animal "half ape and half monkey" and says, "It was our ancestor." On pp 68 and 69 he tells of "the walking ape-man" and says "our ancestor was a beast of like kind."

As samples, Evolution is taught in "Elements of Geology" by W. H. Norton on pp. 407, 408, 410, 412, 414 and 443. "Essentials to Biology," by Geo. W. Hunter, teaches Evolution on pp. 83, 145, 310, 312, 315, 316, 319 and 329. "The First of Science," by J. C. Hessler, teaches Evolution on pp. 329, 333 and 334. "Introduction to Physical Geography" by Gilbert and Brigham teaches Evolution on pp. 345 and 346.

"The New Student's Reference Work," edited by Beach & McCurry—"The doctrine of Evolution is regarded as established beyond controversy." "The general theory of Evolution had a long conflict with religious and philosophical dogma, over which it finally triumphed."

When Mr. Bryan published it broadcast that "with something like a million species of life they have not yet been able to prove that a single species came from another," every Evolutionist on earth stands dumb before the challenge; for, though, according to their wild theory, there have been billions of generations as the lower species slowly evolved into a higher species, in all the fossils of the world *not one proven transitional fossil has been found.* And they call that science! Oh, Science! what vagaries and rottenness have been palmed off on an unsuspecting world in thy name!

But as Mr. Bryan puts it, "When a College Professor winds his intellectual tail around a limb of Darwin's family tree (and swings head downward) he naturally looks down with contempt upon ordinary people who walk on the ground and were made in the image of God. But while this gives amusement to the 'tree man,' it does not disturb the people, except when such men take charge of the educational system of the country and undermine the faith of those entrusted to their care."

CHAPTER IV

Evolution Is Not Science.

Let some facts be kept in mind:

FIRST. This is not a fight between Evolutionists and the preachers. Alas! some preachers, on this terrible issue, have sold themselves to the devil for the sake of popularity, for the sake of being considered "learned" and "up-to-date." Even if it were a battle between the preachers and evolutionists, that would not change the seriousness of the issue. In 1800 there were eighty teachings of science, falsely so-called, that contradicted the Bible, and everyone of them have been proved false and given up. Yet when the terrible teachings of Evolution are exposed, some so-called scientists and college presidents and professors, instead of standing up like men and facing the issue, try to arouse prejudice by trying to make it a fight of the churches against science, and they cry that they are being persecuted, and turn sissy and whine, "They burned Servetus at the stake," "they made Galileo recant!"

But Hon. W. E. Gladstone, England's greatest statesman, was in this fight; so is Sir. Robert Anderson of England; so is our great American statesman, William Jennings Bryan; so are the New York lawyers, Philip Mauro, author of "Evolution at the Bar," and Alfred W. McCann, LL. D., author of "God or Gorilla"; and many of the world's greatest scientists have opposed and fought it, as will be shown in the next chapter.

Second. It is not a fight against science. Where is the church or the preacher who fights against real

science? Where is the church or the preacher who fights against the science of astronomy? the science of chemistry, physics, physiology, electricity? The Bible and real science never conflict, for God is the God of both. It can be easily shown that the Bible is in advance of science. In my young manhood I taught science in one of our colleges and I have studied it closely for thirty-five years.

Third. The issue is, shall an unproven theory, that is not science at all, that was repudiated by England, that was taken up by Germany who was damned by it, and has been repudiated by her leading scientists, and which has now been taken up by a lot of half-baked scientists in America who are college presidents and professors, which destroys faith in God's word and robs the people, the boys and girls in our public schools and the young men and women in our State Universities and State Normals of a real Saviour and real Redeemer, be taught in our schools that are supported by the taxes of the people, simply because they call it "science," when it is not real science?

Evolution is not science. Face the facts: Science is *knowledge, classified knowledge.*

"Science is not speculation, but knowledge; not half truths, but whole truths; not hypotheses which may explain the phenomena of nature, but principles which do explain them and at the same time are verified by them. . . . The opinions of a scientific man, however plausible, nay, however probable, are not science, not even though they prevail so generally as to make dissent from them seem a mark of an illiberal and narrow mind. There have been many such opinions thus dominant at former periods, but now ob-

solete and even objects of ridicule."—Professor Andrew P. Peabody, LL. D., Harvard University, "Christianity and Science," p. 3.

A great scientist lays down the principle: "Directly a fact refuses to be pigeon-holed, and will not be explained on theoretical grounds, *the theory must go,* or it must be revised to admit the new fact."—Sir William Crooks, "Living Age," Vol. 238, p. 318.

Let us see if Evolution is real science.

Charles W. Elliott, President Emeritus of Harvard University, recently was asked: "Is Cope's statement that Evolution is the science of creation correct?" and he answered: "Evolution does not seem to me to be a science of creation or of anything else. It is merely a hypothesis." (A guess.—T. T. M.) Again he was asked: "Is not Evolution a universal process, beginning in the organic world and flowing as a continuous stream through the ages, including all material and psychological changges that have taken place or will take place in the future?" He replied: "Evolution is a hypothesis (a guess—T. T. M.) and not a science at all." Again he was asked: "Is Evolution to be regarded as a science or only as a theory?" He replied:, "Evolution is only a theory."

President Hadley of Yale University was asked: "Is Evolution a universal process beginning in the inorganic world and flowing as a continuous stream stream through the ages?" He replied, "It is possible that it may be, but it has not been proved, and the proof is very difficult. It is not a universal science because *it is no science at all.*"

"The flimsy evidence upon which Darwinites build

their fate, would not be sufficient to convict a person of petty larceny in any court in the civilized world."—William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. Darwin said: "There are two or three million of species on earth—sufficient field, one might think for observation. But it must be said today that in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, *not one change of a species into another is on record.*"—Life and Letters, Vol. 3, p. 25.

Since then for over fifty years the Evolutionists have called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon saying, "O Baal, hear us! But there was no voice nor any that answered." They have compassed sea and land, the dead, among the fossils of the world, and the living, and *not one single case of a change of one species into another.* And then they have the face to come out and say that Evolution is "Science!"

"Nothing has been positively proved as to the question at issue. From its very nature, Evolution is beyond proof. . . . The difficulties offered to an unhesitating acceptance of Evolution are very great, and *HAVE NOT GROWN LESS SINCE THE appearance of Darwin's 'Origin of Species', but have in some respects grown greater.*"—Prof. W. H. Conn in "Evolution of Today" pp 107-203.

"All these theories have not passed beyond the rank of hypothesis."—Dr. Rudolph Schmidt in "Theories of Darwin," p 61.

"We cannot think the theory yet converted into a scientific fact, and those are perhaps the worst foes to its success who are over-hasty to take it and use it as a proved fact."—Prof. Whitney of Yale University, in "Oriental and Linguistic Studies," pp 293-4.

"Those who hold the doctrine of Evolution are by no means ignorant of the uncertainty of their data, and they only yield to it a provisional assent."—Prof. Tyndall in "Fragments of Science," p 162.

"The great stubborn fact which every form of the theory encounters at the very outset is, that notwithstanding variations, we are ignorant of *a single instance* (italics mine—T. T. M.) of the derivation of one good species from another."—Prof. Winchell, in "The Doctrine of Evolution," p 54.

Professor Vernon Kellogg of Leland Stanford University in "Darwinism Today," p 18: "Speaking by and large we only tell the general truth when we declare that no indubitable cases of species-forming or transforming, that is, of descent, have been observed, and that no recognized cases of natural selection really selecting have been observed."

"It is true enough that naturalists have been unable to find a single unquestioned instance of a new species. . . . It will be admitted at the outset on all sides, that no unquestioned instance has been observed of one species being derived from another."—Prof. Conn, in "Evolution of Today," p 23.

"After much consideration, and with assuredly no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is our clear conviction that as the evidence now stands it is not absolutely proved that a group of animals, having all the characteristics exhibited by species in Nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether natural or artificial." —Prof. Huxley, "Lay Sermons," p 295. And yet they call it "Science!"

Professor Huxley again: "In the present condition of our knowledge and our methods one verdict,

'*not proven and not provable*' must be recorded against all grand hypothesis of the paeleoontologist respecting the general succession of life on the globe."

"Evolution also tells us how legs originated. The earliest animals were without legs. Some animal in this legless state found on his body some slight excrescences or warts, which aided materially its progress as it wiggled along, and thus it acquired the habit of using these warts. This habit it transmitted to its posterity and they increased the habit until the excrescences, lengthened and strengthened by use, became legs of a rudimentary kind, which by further use developed a system of bones and muscles and nerves and joints such as we have ourselves. (But it is now demonstrated that acquired characteristics cannot be inherited and Herbert Spencer admitted "*either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no evolution.*"—T. T. M.)

"Eyes originated from some animal having pigment spots or freckles on the sides of its head, which, turned to the sun, agreeably affected the animal so that it acquired the habit of turning that side of its head to the sun, and its posterity inherited the same habit and passed it on to still other generations. The pigment spot acquired sensitiveness by use and in time a nerve developed which was the beginning of the eye. From this incipient eye came the present wonderful combination of lenses, nerves and muscles, all so accurately adjusted that, of the sixteen possible adjustments of each part, only once in a hundred thousand times would they come together, as they now are, by chance.

"Land animals began thus, according to Evolution: In a time of drought some water animals, strand-

ed by the receding waters, were obliged thenceforth to adopt land manners and methods of living. Although, strangely, the whale by the same cause was forced to the water, for it was once a land animal, but in a season of drought was obliged to seek the water's edge for the scant remaining herbage, and, finding the water agreeable, remained there and its posterity also, and finally, the teeth and legs, no longer needed, became decadent and abortive as we see them now. Darwin inferred the history of the whale's marine career from seeing a bear swimming in a pool and catching insects with his wide-open mouth as it so skimmed the water's surface.

("In North America, the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with widely-open mouth, thus catching, like a whale, insects in the water. I see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered by Natural Selection more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale."—Darwin in Origin of Species, First Edition, p 214.)

"The same drought produced another and wonderful change, for it is to this that the giraffe owes his long legs and neck. The herbage on the lower branches withering up, he was obliged to stretch his neck and legs to reach the higher up branches. (Evolutionists say the elephant, to reach the ground for food and water, stretched his nose till it became his proboscis. Why did not the giraffe stretch his nose like the elephant instead of his neck and forelegs?—T. T. M.) This increased, as all such changes increased, in his posterity, and finally after many generations produced the present immense reaching powers of the giraffe. (But it has been proven that acquired characteristics *cannot be inherited* and *"either there has been inheritance of*

acquired characteristics or there has been no evolution. Herbert Spencer. And they call that "Science!" And yet, that is *the best they can do* to get rid of the Bible as God's word, the Saviour as Redeemer, and get rid of Hell and doom our children.—T. T. M.) So that the same drought deprived the whale of its legs and conferred them upon the giraffe."—The Other Side of Evoution, pp 32-34.

And they call that "Science!!" And they force us to pay taxes to have this taught to our children and thus lead them to give up the Bible as God's word and to give up the Saviour as our Redeemer, and we submit to it like dumb-driven cattle.

"We cannot prove that a single species has changed."—Darwin's son in the Biography of his father.

"That the claim that the hypothesis of descent is secured scientifically must most certainly be denied."—Professor Zoeckler, University of Greifswald.

"A survey of the field shows that Darwinianism in its old form is becoming a matter of history, and that we are actually witnessing its death-struggle."—Dr. E. Dennert.

Even from Chicago University there comes a voice: "(1) It is generally believed that acquired characteristics are not inherited. (That is the death knell of one species evolving into another—*it is absolutely impossible for one species to evolve into another if there is no inheriting acquired characteristics.*—T. T. M.) (2) The slight variations used by the theory of natural selection cannot be continued by continuous selection beyond the boundary of the species (That kills Evolution again.—T. T. M.) (3) Forms preserved by

artificial selection revert. (4) The selection among such slight variations is one that can have no decided advantage." (Where is any ground for Evolution left? —T. T. M.)—Professor Coulter, University of Chicago.

"Either there has been an inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no evolution."—Herbert Spencer.

"It is evident that if a species forms a variety that becomes a new species, certain things must occur during the process: First, that a favorable variation should occur in nature; second, that the individual possessing the variation shoud be separated from the other individuals of the species to prevent merging by mingling with forms that do not possess the variation; third, that a number of the individuals possessing the variation should get together in order that the variation might be propagated; fourth, be cross-sterile with the parent forms, but be fertile with each other. I need not remark that these difficulties have not been overcome by means of very slight changes through many generations."—Alfred Fairhurst, A. M., D. Sci., in "Theistic Evolution," p 91. *That alone is enough to kill Evolution with any clear thinking man.*

Here is another crushing witness against Evolution: Collapse of Evolution, p 1: *"If species do not ecquire new faculties, it is absolutely impossible to evolve one species from another. If acquired characteristics cannot be inherited, which is now admitted by the leading Evolutionists, it is absolutely impossible to evolve one species from another."*

Why don't the Evolutionists answer Sir William Dawson's question—"When we find abundance of ex-

amples of the young and old, of many fossil species, and can trace them through their ordinary embryonic development, why should we not find examples of the links which bound species together?"—Modern Ideas of Evolution, p 35. *Not one has been found,* though there should be multiplied millions of them if Evolution is true.

"Nothing is more evident in the history of fossil animals and plants of past geological ages than that *persistence or degeneracy is the rule* rather than the exception * * * * * We may almost say that all things left to themselves *tend to degenerate.*"—Modern Ideas of Evolution, Appendix.

Dr. Friedrich Pfaff, professor of natural sciences in the University of Erlanger: "Nowhere in the older deposits is an ape that approximates more closely to man, or man that approximates more closely to an ape, or perhaps a man at all. The same gulf which is found today between man and the ape goes back with undiminished breadth and depth to the tertiary period. This fact alone is sufficient to make its unintelligibleness clear to every one who is not penetrated by the conviction of the infallibility of the theory of the gradual transmutation of, and progressive development of, all organized creatures. If, however, we now find one of the most man-like apes (gibbon) in the tertiary period and this species is still in the same low grade, and side by side with it, at the end of the ice period, man is found in the same high grade as today, the ape not having approximated more nearly to man, and modern man not having become further removed from the ape than the first man, every one who is in a position to draw a right conclusion can infer that the facts contradict a theory of constant progression, development and cease-

less, increasing variation from generation to generation, as surely as it is possible to do."—Age and Origin of Man, p 52.

Prof. Joseph Le Conte, of the University of California, says: "The evidence of geology today is that species seem to come into existence *suddenly,* and *in full perfection,* remain substantially unchanged during the term of their existence, and pass away in full perfection. Other species take their places apparently by *substitution* not by *transmutation.*"

"Most living forms of plants and animals are also found as fossils; but there is no possible way of telling that one kind of life lived and occupied the world before others, or that one kind of life is intrinsically older than any other or than the human race."—Q. E. D. by Professor G. M. Price, p 125.

"It is, however, now universally admitted that in nature the chronological succession of rocks, as determined by fossil remains, is local and not universal."—Prof. H. Alleyne Nicholson, "Manual of Paleontology" General Introduction, pp 47, 52, Third Edition.

Notice, "the chronological succession of rocks,"—"the ages of the different strata," is "determined by fossil remains" and yet they determine the succession of the fossil remains by the ages of the different strata of the rocks!—Simply arguing in a circle—and they call that Science!

"No one kind of fossil can be proved to be really older than another, or than the human race."—Professor George McCready Price, Fundamentals of Geology, p 39. And they call that science!

"As there is often *no perceptible mineral distinction* between many clays, sands, and gravels, *it is only by their imbedded fossils* that geologists can determine the tertiary or Post-tertiary Character."—David Page, Intro. Text book, p 189. And yet Evolutionists depend on the different ages of these rocks to decide which fossil is the oldest. And they call that science!

"The life succession theory has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of Nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of the imagination and an imagination ignorant of a thousand facts, which are now matters of common knowledge." —Professor George McCready Price, in Fundamentals of Geology, p 144.

The Canadian geologist, Sir William Dawson: "The records of the rocks is decidedly against Evolutionists, especially in the abrupt appearance of new forms under separate specific types, and without apparent predecessors . . . . . So we shall find in the progress of organic being, that *every grade of life was in its highest and best estate when first introduced,* and before it was made subordinate to some higher type. This is, in short, one of the great general laws of creation suggested in Genesis and worked out in detail by geology. * * * * * No case is certainly known in human experience where any species of animal or plant has been so changed as to assume all the characteristics of a new species. * * * * * In tracing back animals and groups of animals in geologic times, we find that they always end without any link of connection with previous being, and under circumstances which render any connection highly improbable. * * * * * The introduction of animal types must have been abrupt and by some influence quite different from that of evolution. * * * * * Paleontology

furnishes no evidence as to the actual transformation of one species into another; the drift of its testimony is to show that species come *per saltum* (by a leap). * * * * * Nothing is known about the origin of man except what we are told in Scripture—that God created him with a rational and moral nature, of which there is no trace in the animal kingdom."

In a book entitled "No Struggle for Existence; No Natural Selection," by Dr. Geo. Paulin, a scientist and writer of recognized ability: "It has been the habit of Darwinians to speak confidently of the unbroken chains of life from Paleozoic forms up to the appearance of man. But in truth *there is no such chain.* The geological record reveals today many times the number of finished forms which it contained when Darwin wrote, yet it still remains a tabula rasa in regard to intermediate forms. *Nothing* intervenes between the Molluscs and Crustaceans to help us to understand whence and how the first fish forms were evolved. *Nothing* between the fishes and the first bird forms and the first mammals to indicate how they were built up."

Species of great organic beings, plants and animals, appear suddenly in fossils, with no graded antecedents behind them, but great chasms. All of them have the next lower species after them in line, or with them, never after them. Evolution cannot explain this.

Hence Professor Sedgewick one of England's most eminent geologists said: "Geology—not seen through the mists of any theory, but taken as a plain succession of monuments and facts—offers one firm cumulative argument against the hypothesis of development." (Evolution).

To call it a scientific theory is to slander the word "science." Professor Alfred Fairhurst, A. M. D. Sci., author of "Organic Evolution Considered," "Theistic Evolution," etc.

"No one has stated ascertained facts touching the origin of man more succinctly and more clearly than Dr. Friedrich Pfaff, professor of natural science in the University of Erlanger. He shows conclusively that the age of man is comparatively brief, extending only to a few thousand years; that man appeared suddenly; that the most ancient man known to us is not essentially different from the now living man, and that transitions from ape to man, or from man to ape are nowhere to be found. The conclusion he reaches is that the Scriptural account of Man, which is one and self-consistent throughout, is true; that God made Man in His own image, fitted for fellowship with Himself, a state from which Man has indeed fallen, but *to which restoration is possible through Him who is the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His person.*" —Evolution at the Bar, p 57.

"Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and, this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record."— Darwin in Origin of Species, Murray 1859, p 280.

"I do not pretend that I should have ever have suspected how poor a record of the mutations of life the best preserved geological section presented, had not the difficulty of our not discovering innumerable transitional links between the species which appeared at the commencement and close of each formation, pressed so

hardly on my theory."—Darwin, Origin of Species, p 302.

Isn't that pitiable! Isn't that puerile! Among the millions of fossils of the multiplied thousands of speces *there is not one* of a transitional form, an intermediate, a link, *between any two species*, and Mr. Darwin's only explanation is "the extreme imperfection of the geological record." To any man whose brains have not gone on a vacation, that is the death-knell of Evolution; but "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" Mr. Darwin saw the force of this: *He who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory."* But as Wainwright puts it: "How wide must a chasm be before it is visible to an Evolutionist?"

"The great break in the organic chain between man and his nearest allies, which *cannot be bridged over by any extinct or living species."*—Descent of Man, Vol. 1, p 200. In the face of that admission how can men have the face to call Evolution "science?"

Here is a sample of Evolution: "I can indeed *hardly doubt* that all vertebrate animals having true lungs have descended by ordinary generation from an ancient prototype of which we know nothing (a pure guess, then.—T. T. M.) furnished with a floating apparatus or service bladder" * * * * * *It is conceivable* (a pure guess, then.—T. T. M.) that now utterly lost branchiae *might have been* gradually worked in by natural selection from some quite distinct purpose" * * * * * *It is probable* (a pure guess.—T. T. M.) that organs which at a very ancient period served for respiration have been actually converted into organs of flight." (That is Evolution, to a dot—not *facts*, for they have

not *one single case* of one species evolving from another. *Not one fossil* in the millions of fossils in existence has been found of a transitional specimen; but "it is possible," "it is conceivable," "it is probable"—and they call that science!" and that is what they are using to cause our young people to give up the Bible as God's word and the Saviour as real Redeemer and we are paying for it to be done with our taxes.—T. T. M.)—Origin of Species, p. 101. Over 800 times Mr. Darwin uses such expressions, and they call it "science."

"No one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related (not a particle of proof that they are related.—T. T. M.) classes, namely, mammals, birds and reptiles, were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes, namely amphibians and fishes."—Descent of Man, Vol. 1, p 212. Is that science? How do you *know* they descended *at all* from either?

"Without any doubt a long series of extinct worms were our dead ancestors."—Prof. Haeckel in Anthropogenies, p 399. No wonder we are called "poor worms of the dust!" And yet not one case of actual evolution from one species to another.

Dr. Elam in Contemporary Review, Vol. 29, p 131: "On a general survey of the theory, nothing strikes us more forcibly than the total absence of direct evidence of any one of the steps. No one professes to have ever seen a variety (producing fertile offspring with other varieties) become a species (producing no off-spring or no fertile off-spring, with the original stock.) No one knows of any living or extinct species having given origin to any other, at once or gradually." And *that is yet true,* and still they call it "science."

"Evolution cannot account for wings, either by Natural Selection or by any other supposed method of working. Many able evolutionists have admitted this (Herbert Spencer among them); yet they cling to Evolution, notwithstanding the impossibility of proposing a method by which it could work. Is it because they cannot bear the alternative of recognizing Creation and the Creator?"—Evolution at the Bar, p 41.

The reason they hold on to Evolution, even when they cannot explain things is, that if wings were not produced by Evolution, it would mean design is proven by their existence; and design would mean a Designer, or God; and that would mean a revelation from God; and that would mean a Saviour, a real Redeemer; which would mean repentance and faith in the Redeemer or hell—and they just can't believe in a hell, you know!

Dr. Robert Watts says: "The record of the rocks knows nothing of the evolution of a higher form from a lower form. * * * * * Both nature and revelation proclaim it as an inviolable law, that *like produces like.*"

Dr. J. B. Warren, of the University of California, said recently: "If the theory of Evolution be true, then, during the many thousands of years covered in whole or in part by present human knowledge, *there would certainly be known at least a few instances of the evolution of one species from another.* No such instance *is known.*"

Prof. Owen declares that "no instance of change of one species into another has ever been recorded by man."

George Ticknor Curtis, in a recent book, "Creation or Evolution," says: "The whole doctrine of the development of distinct species out of other species makes demands upon our credulity which is irreconcilable

with those principles by which we regulate, or ought to regulate, our acceptance of any new matter of belief."

Here is Evolution: Schmucker, "The Meaning of Evolution," p 250: *"Our only means of judging relationship between animals is by the similarity of structure;"* that is, that because of the similarity in plan for the fin of the fish, the wing of the bird, the flapper of the whale, the leg of the animal, the arm of the man, therefore they evolved one from the other, the higher from the lower. Then by parity of reasoning a wheelbarrow hatched out a bicycle, a bicycle hatched out a tricycle, a tricycle hatched out a buggy, a buggy hatched out a wagon, a wagon hatched out an automobile, an automobile hatched out a railroad engine! A lead pencil hatched out a goose quill, a goose quill hatched out a steel pen, a steel pen hatched out a fountain pen! Because a fish bears some resemblance to a reptile, therefore the fish is the father of the reptile; because the reptile bears some resemblance to the bird, therefore the reptile is the father of the bird. By that course of reasoning, because the little house bears some resemblance to a big house, therefore the little house is the father of the big house; because the baby shoe bears some resemblance to the father's shoe, therefore the father's shoe came from the baby shoe; because the mocking bird's voice bears some resemblance to the voices of the other birds, therefore the mocking bird is the offspring of all the other birds. And they call that "science!" And you are not a "modern mind" you are not of the "intellectual classes" if you don't accept this.

As Mr. Bryan says, the Evolutionist can see slight similarities, but ignores gigantic differences."

"Similarity of structure proves only uniformity of design."—Patterson. Any one but an Evolutionist can see that—if man and the lower animals are to live in the same world, eat largely the same food, under the same conditions, in the same climate and propagate the same way, why should not God make them on a similar plan?

Dr. Howard Kelly the great physician and scientist of Johns Hopkins: "The Great Artificer may easily, in creating a vast number of forms, destined to live under similar conditions as to food and environment, have adopted one common structural plan for all, even embryologically developing each individual from the simplest expresson to the more complex by causing all to pass through identical phases until each in turn arrived at that stage at which it was destined to stop. The strong obvious argument here is for unity of purpose in the Creator's mind."

The whole Evolution theory is based on taking similarity to mean succession; that because two species are somewhat similar, therefore one evolved out of the other. Because an Ingersoll watch and a Waltham or Elgin are somewhat similar, that does not prove that the Ingersoll had in it the germ of the Waltham or the Elgin, that it "hatched out" the Waltham or the Elgin, that they evolved out of the Ingersol. Because the wheel-barrow has one wheel and the bicycle has two and the motorcycle has two, and the three-wheeled tricycle has three, and the buggy four, and the wagon four, and the automobile four and the railroad engine has more, that does not mean that the germ of the wheel-barrow evolved into the railroad engine, that the railroad engine is the actual offspring of the wheel-barrow. It does mean that there has been some similarity of de-

sign. But the Great Designer is what the Evolutionists are against, and against the Bible being really God's word and against the Saviour being real Deity and our real Redeemer and against there being any hell.

A leading Editor of the South referring to the review by Dr. Howard Kelly, the noted physician and scientist of Johns Hopkins, Batimore, of a recent book on Evolution, says:

"Dr. Kelly points out the most serious results of belief in the evolutionary theory, namely, the rejection of other parts of the Bible than the creation account. Here we have the heart of the whole question. No one can accept the theory of Evolution with all of its implications, and at the same time accept literally as inspired of God, the Genesis account of creation. There is no conflict between true science and the Scriptures, but we are asked to substitute unproven hypothesis for the inspired Scriptures."

And yet, in the face of this, they have the face to call Evolution "Science!" They have the gall to demand that we pay them salaries from our taxes to teach this to our children and through it turn them from faith in God's word and from the Saviour as their Redeemer and send them to hell; and if we dare expose them they whine "persecution," "the church is fighting science!" "they burned Servetus at the stake!"

"An incredible number of shells and corals, sometimes silicified, have been preserved in perfect condition in the limestones, but the connecting forms, which, if they existed, vastly outnumbered the known forms and were of similar materials, are not found. It is evident that the conditions for preserving connecting forms were as favorable as for preseving known forms.

The only conclusion that we draw from this is that the so-called 'missing links' never existed."—Alfred Fairhurst, in "Theistic Evolution." That fact alone is enough to show that Evolution is not science, but is false.

No theory is science which does not account for all the facts which the theory covers. Here are some facts (and there are many others), which Evolution has not explained and will never explain:

The eye. The effort of Evolutionists to account for the eye, is by saying that before there were eyes, a pigment spot or freckle came on some animal (how came it to come there?) and the animal turned that spot to the sun to get more heat, and that irritated the skin and a nerve came there, and at last that produced the eye. No wonder Wm. Jennings Bryan asks, "Can you beat it?" The sun still shines—why don't some eyes come that way now? Why don't they come on different parts of the body of some species? But it would take many generations to evolve the eye, and *Evolutionists now admit that acquired characteristics cannot be inherited;* the positively developed eye of one generation would be an acquired characteristic; it could not be inherited. No wonder Mr. Darwin said the eye made him shudder—this wild guess was the only thing that could save his theory from going to the wall—and it is unworthy of a ten-year-old school boy.

Fins of fishes. On the theory of Evolution fishes evolved from lower species. How did fins first come? No Evolutionist will claim that fins came in one geenration; they could not have come gradually through many generations, *for that would mean inheriting acquired characteristics, and that has been given up by the lead-*

ing Evolutionists. "Either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no evolution."—Herbert Spencer.

Legs from fins. Evolution teaches that reptiles came from fishes, legs from fins. No one claims that legs came from fins in one generation; they could not have come by gradual changes through many generations; *for that would mean inheriting acquired characteristics, which has been given up by the leading Evolutionists.* And remember, *"either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no Evolution."*—Herbert Spencer.

Wings from legs. Evolution claims that birds come from reptiles. The Evolutionists don't even claim that the change from legs to wings came in one generation, but that it came through many generations. But *that would mean inheriting acquired characteristics which they have now given up.*

Feathers. If birds evolved from reptiles, how did they ever get feathers? How could the scales of reptiles ever become feathers? No Evolutionist claims that the scales changed to feathers suddenly, in one generation; for them to have evolved gradually, through many generations, would mean *inheriting acquired characteristics* and that has been given up by the leading Evolutionists.

Electric fish. Mr. Darwin says, "Origin of Species", p 181, "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." Yet hear him just three pages further—p 184: "The electric organs of fishes offer another case of special difficulty; for

it is impossible to conceive by what steps these wondrous organs have been produced." If they were evolved it had to be "by numerous, successive, slight modifications;" *but that means inheriting acquired characteristics, which has been given up by the leading Evolutionists.* And remember, "*either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no Evolution.*"—Herbert Spencer.

Sex. All animals are divided into two classes, those that are produced from a germ-cell, by division of the nucleus, and second, those produced from eggs, the result of sex. As there is no sex in the lower species that came by division of the muscles, *how could sex have been evolved?* No one claims that it was evolved suddenly; that is not Evolution; but by "numerous, successive, slight modifications through many generations;" but *that means inheriting acquired characteristics, and that is not true; it has been given up by the leading Evolutionists;* and "*either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no Evolution.*"—Herbert Spencer.

Mammals. The lowest species are not mammals, milk-giving; they do not suckle their young. How was it possible to pass from the reptilian to the mammalia type? The answer is that the mammae, the teats, were gradually formed by the persistent efforts of the young through many generations. But again *that would have been inheriting acquired characteristics, which has been given up as untrue.* But what would have caused the young to persist in trying to nurse in the absence of mammae, and in the absence of all nourishment? The Evolution of milk glands from reptiles is impossible without inheriting acquired characteristics. Where did these animals learn how to make the chemical combi-

nations to form milk from the food eaten? Whence their ability to make these chemical combinations?

Rudimentary mammae, or teats, of males. From reptiles? But that would only be "by numerous, successive, slight modifications through many generations," and *that would be inheriting acquired characteristics which is no longer taught by leading Evolutionists.* Were these rudimentary mammae or teats of the male formed by the persistent, fruitless efforts of the young, through many generations? Of all the mammals of the earth we find none of the young that foolish now. When they had persisted through many generations in trying to suckle, to get nourishment from the males, after they had, according to Evolution, succeeded in producing the rudimentary mammae or teats, why, after that much encouragement, did the young cease their efforts? For none of the young mammals now try to get nourishment from the males. Have they evolved out of that foolishness? And this is dumped on us as "Science!"

The whale. The Evolutionists deny that the whale swallowed Jonah, but the whale has certainly swallowed the Evolutionists. *Where did the whale come from?* The Evolutionists say that the birds evolved from the reptiles. From what species did the whale evolve? Mr. Darwin, from a man seeing a bear swim around in the water for hours catching insects in its open mouth, makes the supposition that through many generations this could have continued till "by numerous, successive variations" the whale could have evolved? That, at least, is a whale of a guess! And they call that "science!" But *that would mean inheriting acquired characteristics, which has been given up as untrue. "Either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or*

there has been no Evolution."—Herbert Spencer.

The giraffe. Evolution teaches that in a time of drought, the lower branches having withered up, the giraffe had to reach up to higher branches, and so stretched his legs and neck. This increased in succeeding generations, and after many, many generations, the long legs and long neck was evolved. My! that was a mighty long drouth! But *this would mean inheriting acquired characteristics, which has been given up by leading Evolutionists.* It was impossible, therefore, for the giraffe to thus evolve. If the drouth caused the giraffe to thus reach up and stretch its legs and neck, why did not the cow, the horse, the deer, the antelope, the sheep, the goat, in the drouth thus stretch their legs and necks? On this point the Evolutionists maintain a "dignified silence."

The bee. The marvelous instincts of a swarm of bees could not have evolved from some other species in a single generation; for them to have evolved by numerous, slight variations through many generations, would have meant *inheriting acquired characteristics, which the Evolutionists admit does not now occur.* And remember, *"either there has been inheritance of acquired characteristics or there has been no evolution."*—Herbert Spencer.

There are three classes of bees in the hive, the drones which are males, the queen, a fertile female, and the workers which are females, sex really undeveloped —they are sterile. The working bees with their marvellous instincts, have no offspring; the queen, the mother of the working bees, does not have the instincts of the working bees. *The instincts of the working bees could not come by inheritance,* for the queen, the mother,

does not have these instincts; hence Evolution *cannot* account for those instincts. Besides, *acquired characteristics cannot be inherited.*

Further, from what lower species could the bee have evolved? Into what higher species did it evolve?

Remember, that a theory that cannot explain all the facts included in its field, is not science.

There are many facts, there are many species, that Evolution cannot possibly explain. Take two, a large species and a very small one:—

First, the camel. The Credulity of Incredulity, pp 8-11:

"This animal seems to have been the first used in the service of man, and to have been made for service where not even the ass which alone compares with it for patient endurance of fatigue and privation, could be of use. In arid plains, in dreary deserts, where only stunted, acrid and bitter herbs grow, and where water is found only in rare cases, there the camel may march heavily loaded and for days and weeks survive without food or water. He is to the natives of these wilds, the one indispensable possession, and is called, poetically "the ship of the desert."

"No more complete instance of design with relation to human wants can be found in the whole realm of nature. No part of the camel's structure, from the bony framework of his awkward skeleton to the external hair of his coat, could be left out without essential defect, or could be changed with improvement, or indeed, without injury to the creature's general adaptability to man's need. Nay, his seeming defects or deformities are also absolutely necessary to his well-being and his intended service.

"Even the hump and the callosities, which at first seem positive disfigurements, become beauties when intelligent design is their artistic interpreter. There are seven callosities upon which the pressure of the body's weight and the load on the back must be thrown when the animal kneels and rises up. Born as the camel is for the desert, these callosities keep the skin from cracking and becoming irritated and sore, when the parts which they thus protect rest heavily upon the coarse and burning sands. Some have accounted for these huge corns by the usage to which the beast is subjected; but the flaw in this philosophy is found in the fact that these callosities have been observed on the *newly born camel.* However developed afterward, they exist from the first.

"Again, the strong, nipper-like upper incisor teeth are exactly fitted to crop desert pasturage, cutting through the tough plants and dry shrubs that are found here and there on those wild wastes. The nostrils are so constructed that when the stifling sandstorm sweeps over the desert, the camel can effectually close them and exclude the suffocating dust. The elastic cushions that line the spreading feet with pads help him to "float" rather than step, moving easily and noiselessly, as if shod with rubber sandals; and whether the path lies over sand or rock or paved stones, no sound of the footfall of those spongy feet is heard.

"Again, the structure of the stomach is a marvel of design. It not only enables him to digest the coarsest vegetable tissues, but it makes them agreeable to his taste, so that he prefers, to the finest and most delicate pasture, plants which the horse would not touch; and should even then hard fare be lacking, the hump secretes a store of gelatinous fat, which, taken up and

absorbed by the digestive system, sustains the beast until an oasis is reached. As he carries his own supply of provisions for an emergency, so he has his own reservoir of water. A cavity peculiar to the camel, and which has been inaccurately called a 'fifth stomach,' is not only used as a receptacle of remasticated food, but contains a system or series of cells fitted to contain water, and most curiously provided with a reticulated apparatus for closing the cells while the dry food is in the water-bag. From this false stomach, which thus holds water as well as undigested food, Captain Lyon saw water drawn out of the belly of a dead camel, sufficient to quench the thirst of an almost perishing caravan.

"Again, the very build of the Arabian camel, shows that he was meant for burden and not for draught. The deep chest and strong forelegs enable him to carry easily the heavy load placed on them, but the narrow loins and the long, ungainly hind legs do not supply the energy and force necessary for the strain of dragging heavy wagons or weights. There is in the hind elgs an additional joint, by which he is enabled to kneel down and assume the exact posture suitable for receiving burdens on his back and readily arising with them when the caravan marches.

"Such are a few of the many marks of 'destiny' in this 'ship of the desert'. Who so adapted this beast of burden for the exact life he is to lead, and impressed this stamp of design on the camel's new born foal? Admit an intelligent Creator, and the problem presents no difficulty; but deny a Creator, and to all this curious maze we have no clew. Accident must be left to account for a perfection of adaptation that is one of Nature's miracles. Chance will not answer as a solution. As

Rufus Choate said, this is "like dropping the Greek alphabet and expecting to pick up the Iliad."

"But we are told that animals are themselves intelligent and can adapt themselves to their 'environment'. We do not stop to discuss this unsatisfactory philosophy, that leaves unexplained the original mystery of all—how the *first* camel came to form himself for such a destiny, and whence came, in a beast, a discrimination and invention so marvelous."

The efforts of the Evolutionists to explain the evolution of the camel are even more childish, more pitiable and absurd than their explanation of the whale. From what species, next below, did the camel evolve? Into what species, next above, did he evolve?

"If it could be demonstrated that any complete organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." Darwin, Origin of Species, p 189. First Edition. Very well; not only the camel, but the bee, the spider, the water spider, the beaver, sex, mammals, teats of mammals, teats of the male mammal, the Saviour. Evolution cannot explain any one of these.

Yet in *three pages* of where Mr. Darwin said the above he said, p 192, speaking of the electric battery of the electric fish, *"it is impossible to conceive by what steps these wondrous organs have been produced."* Let him who can reconcile this with his statements on page 189.

Take the case of the spider, as given in Orton's Zoology: "Spiders are provided at the posterior end with two or three pairs of appendages called *spinnerets,* which are homologous with legs. The office of the

spinnerets is to reel out the silk from the silk glands, the tip being perforated by a myriad of little tubes, through which the silk escapes in excessive fine threads. An ordinary thread, just visible to the naked eye, is the *union of a thousand or more of these delicate streams of silk.* These primary threads are drawn out and united by their hind legs."

Let the reader now consider the comments of Philip Mauro, the brilliant author of "Evolution at the Bar," p 46:

"Here we find a marvelous co-ordination of special organs: (1) the *silk glands,* capable of secreting a fluid which has the remarkable property of hardening upon exposure to the air; (2) *Spinnerets* having each more than a thousand perforations of microscopic size, without which the silk-glands would be worse than useless; (3) *hind legs* having the wonderful function of forming the thousands of invisible filaments into a thread, without which function both glands and spinnerets would be a serious detriment to their possessor. It is simply impossible that these three organs should have developed gardually, and *independently of each other,* to the stage of perfection in advance of which stage they could not co-operate in the slightest degree to the one end for which they all exist.

"Let it be noted that, if the spinnerets had but *one* aperture, or a *dozen,* or even a *hundred,* the liquid material would not have the required area of exposure to the air to effect that *instant* solidification which is *absolutely essential* to the success of the entire operation. It required *at least a thousand* apertures to produce the desired result. Who knew, or could have known, the need of such a number of orifices? or could have

formed them in a tube the size of a spider's leg? And in what imaginable way could several legs, intended for *locomotion* be evolved into organs so radically different in function? It is not too much to say that those thousands of orifices are just so many witnesses that Evolution is a huge delusion, which has made foolish the wisdom of the wise, and has exposed to deserved ridicule the gullibility of the brightest minds."

From what did the spider evolve? Into what did he evolve?

Let the reader now consider the utter impossibility of the water spider evolving from the ordinary spider. Here is the account as given by Philip Mauro, pp 43-45:

"Like other spiders, the water spider is an air breathing animal, yet, unlike other spiders, it *lives under water*. How did it evolve the extraordinary changes in its organism, and in its habits of life, whereby it acquired first, its set purpose to live under water; and *second*, its special organs and instincts whereby it is enabled to give effect to that strange purpose and to live, thrive and rear its young in such an unnatural environment?

"Of course, if the water spider was *always* a water spider, and was by its Creator endowed with just the organs and instincts that are suited to the manner of life appointed to it, the matter is very simple and intelligible. But we are inquiring how the water spider and its ways could have come about through Evolution. Surely those who press that theory upon their fellow mortals, and who ask them to cast aside the belief in Creation and the Creator—with all that that involves—should at least be required to tell us *How* Evolution

worked, or *could have worked* in such a case. Was ever such a thing heard of, as that we should be asked to believe, *on the ground of 'reason' and 'science'* in a thing so preposterously unreasonable that the imagination can conceive of no possible way in which it could be accomplished?

"Upon examining the water spider, and acquainting ourselves with its ways, we find that its body is covered with hairs in such a way that it does not become wet when in contact with water. In order to live under water, and rear its young there, it must construct a water-proof cell, capable of containing enough air for breathing purposes; it must have means for renewing the supply of air from time to time; and it must have the instincts to guide it in the performance of these necessary operations. And we may confidently add that *the very first* water spider must have been fully equipped for the purposes indicated. It spins under the water an egg-shaped envelope open underneath for entrance and egress. This envelope, which is water-proof, is securely attached to some object so that it will remain submerged. Having constructed its house, the little creature next proceeds to fill it with air. For this necessary operation its hind legs are covered with hair and so constructed that they can take hold of a large bubble of air, and carry it down into the water, and to the opening of its house. There the air is released, and it rises to the top of the envelope, expelling the corresponding quantity of water. This operation is repeated until the cell is sufficiently filled with air. The eggs are then laid in the upper part of this house and are surrounded by a cocoon.

It is manifest that this extraordinary manner of life, and the highly specialized organs, which are vital

to it, could not possibly be the outcome of a long and slow process of development. Before the life of a water spider could even begin, it *must* be equipped with *first,* the means for secreting a water-proof material; *second,* the means for spinning that material into a water-tight cell; *third,* protective hairs to keep it from becoming wet; *fourth,* the peculiar apparatus for filling its house with air; *fifth,* the several instincts which prompt the doing of these remarkable things.

"That there is no trace of the evolution of the water spider (or of any other creature) is reason enough why the theory should be rejected. But we confidently submit that the facts briefly set forth above and the conclusions which necessarily follow for them, constitute proof positive that Evolution is not only an impossibility but an absurdity."

There are said to be two or three millions of species on the earth; yet after all the searching by all the Evolutionists, not one change of one species into another has been found. And yet Evolution means that all these species evolved one from another from the first living cell, from amoeba, to man—without one single case on record of one species evolving from another; they call it science, and demand that we pay their salaries with our taxes for them to teach this to our children, when it means for them to give up their faith in God's word which says that everything "brought forth after its kind," and to send our children out into eternity without a Saviour.

About 800 times in his two books Mr. Darwin uses such expressions as "one may suppose" or "it seems," and then bases his conclusions on these assumptions, and H. G. Wells in his "Outlines of History," Vol. 1, uses one hundred and three pages telling of man's des-

cent from the ape, and yet he uses such expressions ninety-six times. It is little wonder that Prof. Dyson Hague, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada, says: "To read the opening sections of Wells' 'Outline of History,' is to make one marvel at the gullibility of the modern mind. It is monstrous to think that such stuff should be exploited in the name of science or history." Their only course of reasoning is, "This thing is possible; therefore, it is probable; therefore it is certain."

"Could it be shown that but one species originated otherwise than by slight modification of the structure of pre-existent species, that would suffice to overthrow the theory of evolution. But the science of paleontology presents us with clear evidences of *thousands of species coming suddenly into existence*: and on the other hand *there is not the faintest indication that there was ever a species that came into being in any other way."*— Evolution at the Bar, p 37.

Before that crushing fatal fact what will the Evolutionists do? Come out and confess that their theory is not science, that it is wrong? Never! Find an Evolutionist who will confess that he is wrong, will you? Having said that the horse is sixteen feet high, instead of sixteen hands, they will die and go to hell and carry our young people to hell with them with their Evolution, rather than admit that they are wrong. When faced with such fatal facts, they simply say, "so much the worse for the facts," and cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" for the space of two hours, and then whimper, "They burned Servetus at the stake!" and "you are persecuting us!! you will not pay us our salaries to damn the souls of your children;" or with haughty arrgance they will say, "All Scientists now believe in Evolution." We will see about that in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

Evolution Repudiated by Great Scientists and Scholars.

In their writings and in their public lectures and addresses, the Evolutionists are persistently saying that all scientists now believe in Evolution. Professors in the State Universities and State Normals persistently repeat it to the students; that all scientists and all scholars now believe in Evolution; and these go out and repeat it to our boys and girls in the high schools and lower grades of our public schools. As a sample, H. W. Conn, in "The Methods of Evolution" says:

"We find nowhere today any thought of discussing the truth of the law of gravitation * * * * * Science regards it (Evolution) as beyond discussion and accepts it as a demonstrated conclusion. * * * * * It would probably be impossible to find among modern scientists any one who would venture to hold any other opinion."

"The world has been persuaded that Evolution is true."—Professor S. C. Schmucker in "The Meaning of Evolution."

"The thinking man is out of joint with the times when he sets himself against Evolution."—Schmucker, in "The Meaning of Evolution," p 278.

"Now there is not a man of science in the world who does not admit man's descent from an ape-like form; and I do not think there is a bishop in the world who would oppose them."—Joseph McCabe in "The A B C of Evolution."

"The saying often heard, that the scholarship of the world is arrayed on the side of Evolution we do not

hesitate to brand as a falsehood whether spoken by a canon, professor or clergyman. The most thorough scholars, the world's ablest philosophers and scientists, with few exceptions, are at the present time not supporters, but many of them are assailants of Evolution.

"We are a little behind the times on these questions in this country as compared with England, France and Germany, though possibly ahead in almost everything else."—L. T. Townsend, Collapse of Evolution, p 48.

It will surprise the reader to read how many great scientists have repudiated the theory of Evolution. And let it be kept in mind that since these men repudiated it, nothing has been added to the evidence in favor of Evolution. Not one species has been found that evolved from a lower species. On the other hand, spontaneous generation has been killed; Natural Selection has been proven false; and it has been shown that acquired characteristics are not inherited.

Hear these great scientists and scholars:

Sir David Brewster, doubtless the greatest scientist the world ever saw: *"We have absolute proof of the immutability of species,* whether we search in historic or geologic times."

Prof. Lionel S. Beale, who stood with Lord Kelvin at the head of the English scientists, in an address before the Victoria Institute of London, 1903: *There is no evidence* that man has descended, or is, or was, in any way specially related to any other organism in nature, through Evolution or by any other process. In support of all rationalistic conjectures, concerning man's origin, there is *not, at this time, a shadow of scientific evidence."*

And since he said this, spontaneous generation, Natural Selection and inheriting acquired characteristics, have all been given up.

St. George Mivart of the University College, Kensington: "I cannot truly characterize it but by an epithet I employ with great reluctance. I weigh my words and have present to my mind the many distinguished naturalists who have accepted the notion; and yet *I cannot call it anything but a puerile hypothesis.*"

Louis Pasteur who proved that spontaneous generation was false: *"Posterity will one day laugh at the foolishness of modern materialistic philosophers. The more I study nature, the more I stand amazed at the works of the Creator."*

Hear two great scholars, not scientists, but who know what science is:

John Ruskin: "I have never yet heard one logical argument in its favor. I have heard and read many that are beneath contempt." The Eagle's Nest, p 256.

Dr. John Clark Ridpath, the great historian: "The eagle was always an eagle, the man always man. Every species of living organism has, I believe, come up by a like process from its own primordial germ."

"It is a strange fact that no great scientific authority in Great Britain in exact science, science that reduces its conclusions to mathematical formulae, has endorsed Evolution,"—D. S. Gregory, Editor Homistatic Review.

Sir Roredick Murchison: "I know as much of nature in her geologic ages as any living man, and I fearlessly say that our geologic record does not afford one syllable of evidence in support of Darwin's theory."

The great Swiss geologist, Joachim Barronde, quoted by Prof. Winchell in Doctrine of Evolution. p 142: "One cannot conceive why in all rocks whatever and in all countries upon the two continents, all relics of the intervening types should have vanished. * * * * * The discordances are so numerous and pronounced that the composition of the real fauna seems to have been calculated by design for contradicting everything which the theories (of Evolution) teach us respecting the first appearance and primitive evolution of the forms of life upon the earth."

The pitiable dodge of the Evolutionists on this point is that the geologic record is so incomplete. But there are millions of fossils of the different species, some of the very young of the different species, some even of the embryo, yet *not one single fossil* has been found of any being between any two species.

Another pitiable dodge is that the multiplied millions of beings, of all the different species, in evolving from one species to another through many generations by numerous very slight variations were so delicate they did not survive. But Evolution teaches "the survival of the fittest." Then these intervening things between the species were more fit than the species below; yet not one of them survived. "The legs of the lame are not equal."

As a matter of fact, if Evolution were true, there would be no species at all; but only very slight variations from one generation to the next above it; only a very slight variation of one being from the one below it and above it, from amoeba to man. The fact of species, and that they are infertile to each other, is itself a proof that Evolution is false.

"If Evolution were the law of progress of the universe, it is manifest that there would be no species or other lines of division. There would be only *individual forms,* shading imperceptibly one into another, each in the process of becoming something else, so that classification would be an impossibility. The world, that lies before us, composed of clearly marked divisions, orders, classes, species, all sharply defined and separated one from another by impassable barriers, *is just the opposite* of such a world as the supposed law of Evolution would produce."—Evolution at the Bar, p 21.

Professor Fleischman of Erlanger: "The Darwin theory of descent has in the realm of nature *not a single fact to confirm it.* It is not the result of scientific research, but *purely the product of the imagination.*"

Prof. Haeckel, one of the greatest Evolutionists, bemoaned the fact that he was standing almost alone: "Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of Evolution, and particularly Darwinism, is an error and cannot be maintained." And yet in the face of this statement of Haeckel's and in the face of the statements of these great scientists, Professors in Universities and Colleges will stand before our young men and women, boys and girls, and say, "All scientists and scholars agree that Evolution is right," and destroy their faith in God's word and send them to hell when this little life is over.

Then they whine and dodge again and say, "I don't believe in Darwinism Evolution." *There is no other kind.* It is true, that some of Darwin's theories have been given up; but the central teaching of Darwin was that all species from the first living cell have been evolved up to man "by numerous slight variations

through many generations." *There is no other kind of Evolution.*

"It is utterly unscientific and, if we may speak all our mind, it is downright idiocy for men to parade on the street or in the church or through the press or on the platform these exploded theories of Evolution by natural selection or by the survival of the fittest as if they still were current in the scientific world."—Prof. L. T. Townsend, in Evolution or Creation, p 118.

Cuvier: "That such transformations as are claimed by the Evolutionists *are wholly unknown to the realm of nature* is a point upon which *the most distinguished geologists and anatomists are unanimous.*" Was Cuvier lying? Was he an ignoramus and did not know what these geologists and anatomists taught? And yet your half-baked scientists and some University and College professors keep on repeating, "All scientists now accept evolution." Has Evolution taken away all their sense of shame?

Professor Francis M. Balfour: "All these facts contradict *the crude ideas of those so-called naturalists* who state that one species can be transformed into an other in the course of generations."

Dr. Charels Elam: "The hypothesis of natural selection *is not directly supported by any fact in the whole range of natural history or paleontology;* but on the other hand, every fact which is known with certainty in those sciences, so far as it bears upon natural selection, directly disapproves of it."

"Of the older and honored chiefs in natural science many, unfortunately, are still opposed to Evolution in every form."—Darwin in Descent of Man.

"Our foes are to some extent they of our own household, including not only the ignorant and the passionate, but a minority of *minds of high calibre and culture."—Professor Tyndall.*

Sir Charles Bell, professor of the University College of London and member of the Royal Societies of London and Edinburgh: "Everything declares the species to have their origin in a distinct creation, not in a gradual variation from some original type."

Dr. Traas, the paleontologist who devoted his long life to the study of fossil animals, is likewise pronounced against Evolution: "The idea that mankind is descended from any Simian species whatever, is certainly the most foolish ever put forth by man writing on the history of man. It should be handed down to posterity as a new edition of the Memorial on Human Follies. *No proof of this baroque theory can be given from discovered fossils."*

Professor Elie de Cyon, of Russian-French descent, a member of the faculty of the University of St. Petersburg, in his recent publication, "God and Science": "The two bases of Darwinism are the natural selection of the fittest and the hereditary transmission of characteristics acquired in the struggle for existence. It is curious to note that these bases have been broken down by two evolutionists, Herbert Spencer and Wisemann. * * * * * The theory that marvelous operations involved in the transmutation of species, are to be explained solely by the accidents for the struggle for existence is the most preposterous conception that has been brought forward since the days of Empedocles. * * * * * Let us have the courage to confess that we have not up to the present time advanced a single step toward the solution of this problem."

Professor Wilhelm Max Vundt of Leipsic in his younger days wrote books in support of Evolution. In a later publication he refers to these writings, as "the great crime of his youth that will take him all the rest of his life to expiate."

Dr. Etheridge of the English Muheum: *"In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of transmission of species.* Nine-tenths of the talk of Evolution is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by fact. Men adopt a theory and then strain their facts to support it. I read all their works, but they make no impression on my belief in the stability of species. *Moreover the talk of the great antiquity of man* is of no value. Some men are ready to regard you as a fool if you do not go with them in all their vagaries; but *this museum is full of the proof of the utter falsity of their views."*

Dr. Virchow, "the highest German authority in physiology" and "the foremost chemist on the globe," who at first accepted Evolution and wrote much in favor of it, but who afterward repudiated it: *"It is all nonsense. It cannot be proved by science that man descended from the ape or from ony other animal. Since the announcement of the theory, all real scientific knowledge has proceeded in the opposite direction."*

Professor E. G. Conklin of Princeton University: "There is no longer any doubt among scientists that man descended from the animals."

H. W. Conn in "The Method of Evolution: "It would probably be impossible to find among modern scientists any one who would venture to hold any other opinion."

Joseph McCabe in "The A B C of Evolution: "Now there is not a man of science in the world who does not admit of man's descent from an ape-like form; and I do not think there is a bishop in the world who would oppose them."

In the face of the above testimonies from scientists and scholars, does that statement take your breath? Don't be surprised; that is about as near as the average Evolutionist ever comes to the truth; that's about as near as the average evolutionist faces facts.

Let it be remembered that Dr. Virchow was one of the greatest advocates of Evolution that it has ever had; and yet he turned against it and the above is his verdict.

Sir J. William Dawson: "Story of the Earth and Man," p 317: "It is one of the strangest phenomena of humanity; it is utterly destitute of proof."

Professor Zockler: "It must be stated that the supremacy of this philosophy has not been such as was predicted by its defenders at the outset. A mere glance at the history of the theory during the four decades that it has been before the public shows that the beginning of the end is at hand."

Prof. Paulson of Berlin stated that the mechanical theory of Darwinism is rejected by such scientists as Naegeli; Koelliker, M. Wagner, Snell, Fovel, Bunge, the physiological chemist, A. Bracon, Hoffman and Askernazy, botanists; Oswald Heer, the geologist, and Otto Hamann, the zoologist; Carl Ernst von Baer, the eminent zoologist and anthropologist in early years came near accepting Evolution, but at a later date utterly rejected it.

Agassiz: "I wish to enter my earnest protest against the transmutation theory. It is my belief that naturalists are chasing a phantom in their search after some material gradation among created beings, by which the whole animal kingdom may have been derived by successive development from a single germ or from a few germs. I confess that there seems to me a repulsive poverty in this material explanation that is contradicted by the intellectual grandeur of the universe. I insist that this theory is opposed to the processes of Nature, as we have been able to comprehend them; that it is contradicted by the facts of Embryology and Paleontology, the former showing us forms of development as distinct and persistent for each group as are the fossil types of each period revealed to us by the latter; and that the experiments on domestic animals and cultivated plants, on which its adherents base their views, are entirely foreign to the matter in hand."

Dr. N. S. Shaler, professor of geology in Harvard University, eminent as a scientist, writing for the International Quarterly, December-March, 1902-1903: "It begins to be evident to naturalists that the Darwinian hypothesis is still essentially unverified. Notwithstanding the evidence derived from the study of animals and plants under domestication, it is not yet proved that a single species of the two or three millions now inhabiting the earth had been established solely, or mainly, by the operation of natural selection." And not one *fact* have they discovered since then that proves Evolution.

Professor C. C. Everett, also of Harvard: "If in the past those ranks of beings ever rose and moved in procession along the upward slope, each passing, by no matter how slow a step, out of its own limitations, and

in itself or in its posterity entered upon a larger life, it was before the eyes of man were opened to them. No searching of his awakened powers can detect, even among the remains of an unknown antiquity, any glimpse of the great movement while in progress of accomplishment. All, as he looks upon it, is as fixed as the sphinx, that slumbers on the Egyptian sands."

"Our earliest knowledge of man is of a being fully formed and in possession of all the faculties of his kind."—G. Frederick Wright, L.L. D., F. G. S. A., author of "The Ice Age in North America."

Professor August Weisman of the University of Frieburg "demonstrated beyond all question" *THAT ACQUIRED CHARACTERISTICS BY A PARENT CANNOT BE TRANSMITTED TO THE OFFSPRING.* Prof. William Bateson of England, the greatest living Biologist, in his address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Toronto, Canada, December, 1921, admitted and stated it positively, *THAT ACQUIRED CHARACTERISTICS CANNOT BE INHERITED.* Elsewhere he said, *"AN ORGANISM CANNOT PASS ON TO ITS OFFSPRING A FACTOR WHICH IT DID NOT ITSELF RECEIVE IN FERTILIZATION."*

Professor S. C. Schmucker, in "The Meaning of Evolution," p. 261, says: "The blight of the fact that acquired characteristics cannot be transmitted, meets us here." He hits the nail on the head—"the blight of the fact"; for it certainly blights Evolution—how *can* there be evolution from lower to higher species if there is no transmitting acquired characteristics? "How wide must a chasm be before it becomes visible to an evolutionist?"

Professor Goethe of Strasburg, published a history of Darwinism in the Unschau, 1903, in which he says that it has passed through four stages: "(1) the beginning, when it was received with great enthusiasm; (2) the period where it flourished and found general acceptance; (3) the period of transition and sober second thought when its principles and teachings were called in question; (4) the final period, upon which the scientific world has just entered, and where its days will evidently be numbered."

Here in America we are only in the second period when it is flourishing and finding general acceptance. The third period is beginning and will be followed by the fourth; but alas! while we are waiting for the last two periods to pass, many, many of our sons and daughters will have been swept into hell by it, if we do not arouse ourselves and shut it out of our tax-supported schools, from primary to State university.

Edward von Hartmann gives the same four stages of Darwinism and states that the opposition "gradually swelled into a great chorus of voices, aiming at the overthrow of the Darwinian theory. In the first decade of the twentieth century it has become apparent that the days of Darwinism are numbered. Among the latest opponents are such savants as Einier, Gustav Wolf, DeVries, Hocke, Von Wellstein, Fleischmann Renicke and many others."

Prof. John S. Newberry: "It is doubtful if at any time in the world's history there has been a theory that has gained so great popularity with such an unsubstantial basis as that of Evolution of man from the lower orders."

Dr. William Hanna Thomson, former president of the New York Academy of Medicine: "The Darwinian theory is now rejected by the majority of biologists as absurdly inadequate, owing to its principle being wholly negative. Selection of any kind does not produce anything, but only chooses between that which already exists. Evolution never was a cause of anything. It is almost pathetic to read how Huxley and Darwin, in their day, fancied that because the primate homo-man was so well in keeping with the evolution of the other primates, therefore they had scientifically accounted for man. It is absurd to rank man among the animals. His so-called fellow animals, the primates —gorilla, orang and chimpanzee—can do nothing truly human."

W. H. Conn, in "The Method of Evolution: "It would probably be impossible to find among modern scientists anyone who would venture to hold any other opinion." That's just like them! What do you think of that, reader, in view of the testimonies in this chapter? But there are more to follow:

Dr. Leavitt, Ex-President of Lehigh University: "All the facts of the past cycles of the earth are against Darwinism. Protoplasm evolving a universe is a superstition more pitiable than the paganism which worshipped the image of Diana as the mother of creation."

The late Professor Agassiz, in "Methods of Study in Natural History: "As a paleonthologist I have from the beginning stood aloof from this new theory of the transmutation of species now so widely admitted by the scientific world. Its doctrines in fact contradict what the animal forms buried in the rocky strata of the earth tell us of their own introduction and succes-

sion on the surface of the globe. The theory *IS A SCIENTIFIC MISTAKE UNTRUE IN ITS FACTS, UNSCIENTIFIC IN ITS MEHODS, AND MISCHIEVOUS IN ITS TENDENCY.* There is not a fact known to science tending to show that any being in the natural process of reproduction and multiplication has ever diverged from the course natural to its kind, or that a single kind has ever been transmuted into any other."

"All geological evidences thus far discovered not only fail to carry man back to a remote antiquity, but bring him down to a date so recent that the hypothesis of Evolution by any namable natural process is no longer entitled to a moment's consideration."—Prof. L. T. Townsend, in Evolution or Creation, p. 198

There is one claim of Evolution which the Evolutionists constantly make, always stating it as an actual established fact, without which their theory of Evolution from amoeba up through different species to man, has not one square inch of ground to stand on—that claim is that man has been on this earth five hundred thousand years or more. They *must* have this vast period in order to have any Evolution of man.

"There has been relatively little improvement in the human stock during all the five hundred thousand years of man's occupation of this planet."—Pres. W. L. Poteat, of Wake Forest College. Professor E. G. Conklin, Professor of Biology in Princeton University, in "The Direction of Human Evolution, p. 37: "In *the thousands of centuries* which separate the origin of the earliest human types from the period of written history mankind has wandered over all parts of the earth."

"Mr. Thomas Sterry Hunt, late president of the British Anthropological Society, announced the extra-

ordinary opinion that man has been on this earth nine million years. M. Lalande declared (1867) that "man is eternal." Dr. A. R. Wallace is of the opinion that five hundred thousand years are sufficient for human history. Professor C. Fuhlrott, a German of note, estimates man's age at two or three hundred thousand years. M. Gabriel de Mostellet, professor of anthropology in Paris, argues that man appeared on the earth two hundred and thirty thousand years ago."—Evolution of Creation, pp. 189, 190.

Professor Arnold L. Gesell, Ph. D., Department of Psychology, Los Angeles State Normal, in "The Normal Child and Primary Education," a book used to train teachers to go out and teach our boys and girls in the public schools:

"The span of man's distinctly human sojourn on the earth *measures a half million years.* Some would multiply this by two."

Professor S. C. Schmucker, in "The Meaning of Evolution," p. 222: "Its close, occupying the last few hundred thousand years, is known as the Age of Man." Again, p. 253: "Through the last hundred thousand years the development of man has been wonderfully rapid."

These quotations from Evolutionists could be multiplied. Now, reader, keep these bald, unsupported statements in mind, while we consider some facts. *AND REMEMBER THAT THERE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN EVOLUTION IF MAN HAS NOT BEEN ON THE EARTH FOR HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF YEARS.* There has been an ice age on the earth, the glacial period. Hear some scientists, as given by Fairhurst, in Theistic Evolution:

"Prof. Alexander Winchell: 'Man has no place till after the reign of ice. It has been imagined that the close of the reign of ice dates back perhaps a hundred thousand years. *THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF THIS.* The fact is that we ourselves came upon the earth in time to witness the retreat of the glaciers.'"

"Professor Holmes says that the great ice sheet spread over Northern Asia and America three hundred thousand years ago and *DID NOT DISAPPEAR TILL ABOUT TEN THOUSAND YEARS AGO.*

"Prof. George Frederick Wright, one of the highest authorities on the glacial epoch, has reached the conclusion that it *ENDED NOT EARLIER THAN FROM SEVEN TO TEN THOUSAND YEARS AGO.*

"Prof. Joseph Prestwich collected much evidence which goes to show that the close of the glacial period falls within the limits of *EIGHT TO TWELVE THOUSAND YEARS AGO.*

"M. Adhemar and James Croll believed that it closed *NOT EARLIER THAN ELEVEN THOUSAND YEARS AGO.*

"Prof. Rollin D. Salisbury and Dr. Warrem Upham, among the most recent American geologists, think *THAT SEVEN TO TEN THOUSAND YEARS AGO IS A FAIR ESTIMATE.*

"In a review article (1904) Dr. Upham, speaking of the post-glacial era, says that from the studies of Niagara by Wright and myself, coinciding approximately with the estimate of Winchell and with a large number of estimates and computations collected by Hanson from many observers in America and Europe,

it *CERTAINLY SEEMS WELL DEMONSTRATED THAT THIS PERIOD (POST-GLACIAL) IS FROM SEVEN THOUSAND TO TEN THOUSAND YEARS.*"

"Dr. Wm. Andrews thinks that the ice age closed *'NOT FURTHER AWAY THAN FIVE TO SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED YEARS AGO.'*

"Prof. Edward Hall, secretary of the Victoria Institution, London, a specialist on these matters, says: *'NOT IN ONE SINGLE CASE IN THE WHOLE OF EUROPE OR AMERICA HAS A TRACE OF MAN'S EXISTENCE BEEN FOUND BELOW THE ONLY DEPOSITS WHICH WE HAVE A RIGHT TO ASSUME WERE DEVELOPED AND PRODUCED BY THE GREAT ICE SHEETS OF THE EARLY GLACIAL PERIODS.'* This is fully concurred in by Professors Hayes, LeConte, Boyd, C. H. Dawkins, Dr. Gandry, John Evans, W. H. Holmes, M. Favre and by not a few others."

"Prof. W. H. Haynes, a leading American geologist, says: 'The evidence for the antiquity of man on the hypothesis of evolution is purely speculative, *NO HUMAN REMAINS HAVING AS YET BEEN FOUND IN EITHER MIOCENE OR PLIOCENE STRATA.'*

"Prof. Joseph Le Conte says: *'THE MIOCENE MAN IS NOT AT PRESENT ACKNOWLEDGED BY A SINGLE CAREFUL GEOLOGIST.'*

"M. Reinach, author of 'La Prehistorique,' says: *'THERE ARE NO TRACES OF MAN ANYWHERE IN THE TERTIARY PERIOD WHICH BRINGS US TO THE THRESHOLD OF HISTORIC TIMES.'*

"The present teaching of geology is that man is not of nature's making. . . . Independently of such evidences, man's high reason, his unsatisfied longings, aspirations, his free will, all afford the fullest assurance that he owes his existence to the special act of the Infinite Being whose image he bears."—Professor Dana, in Geologic Story, p. 290.

Prof. G. Frederick Wright, LL. D., F. G. S. A., author of "The Ice Age in North America," "Man and the Glacial Period," "Asiatic Russia," " Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History," etc., etc., says of Glaciology: "It has been the subject of my special study for forty years," and refers to "the extreme estimates of man's antiquity *WHICH ARE RECKLESSLY MADE BY MANY WITH LITTLE REGARD TO THE FACTS IN THE CASE.*"

Hear him: "The habit which many anthropologists have of ruling out all evidence which does not support some special theory of development is unworthy of scientific investigators."

"Post-glacial time is to be reckoned by thousands of years, rather than by hundreds of thousands, or even tens of thousands."—Professor G. Frederick Wright, in Origin and Antiquity of Man, p. 480.

"THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN, THEREFORE, SO FAR AS THE QUESTION DEPENDS UPON HIS CONNECTION WITH THE GLACIAL EPOCH, IS NO PROVED TO BE, EVEN WHEN WE ALLOW A GENEROUS MARGIN, GREATER THAN TWELVE OR FIFTEEN THOUSAND YEARS."—Origin and Antiquity of Man, p. 494.

"A BRIEF REVIEW OF SOME OF THE PRINCIPLES ALREADY DISCUSSED WILL SHOW

THAT THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY FOR PLACING THE ORIGIN OF THE HUMAN RACE MANY THOUSAND YEARS BEFORE THE BEGINNING OF HISTORY."—Origin and Antiquity of Man, p. 493.

Yet in the face of these scientists, the Evolutionists will continue to say that man has been on the earth "five hundred thousand years." Why? Because it is necessary to their theory, and without it this theory goes to the wall. They have no facts for their "five hundred thousand years"—the facts are the other way; but what do they care for facts? Their unproven theory must stand and the teaching that men have been on the earth hundreds of thousands of years is necessary to save their Evolution. Such misleading, such juggling, is unworthy of a fourth ward politician.

"Dr. J. A. Zahm, the distinguished scholar, says: 'I am disposed to attribute to man an antiquity of about ten thousand years. It seems likely that the general concensus of chronologists will ultimately fix on a date which shall be below rather than above ten thousand years as the nearest approximate to the age of our race.' (The Bible, Science and Faith, p. 311.) He quotes many other authorities.

"Professor Winchell tells us, 'The very beginnings of our race are still almost in sight.' (Sketches of Creation.) Dawson thinks man has been on earth about seven thousand years. *GEOLOGY AGREES THAT MAN DID NOT EXIST BEFORE THE ICE AGE.* The stone age is fixed at about seven thousand years ago by others.

"Prof. George Frederick Wright tells us, 'The glacial period did not close more than ten thousand

years ago. This shortening of our conception of the ice age renders glacial man a comparatively modern creature. The last stage of the excessive unstability of the earth was not so very long ago and continued down to near the introduction of man.'

"S. R. Pattison, F. G. S., tells us, 'Science shows to us a number of converging probabilities which point to man's first appearance along with great animals about 8,000 years ago.'

"Dr. Friedrich Pfaff, professor of natural science in Erlanger, thus sums up the evidence from geology as to man: '(1) *THE AGE OF MAN IS SMALL, EXTENDING ONLY TO A FEW THOUSAND YEARS.* (2) Man appeared suddenly; the most ancient man known to us is not essentially different from the now living man. (3) Transitions from the ape to the man, or the man to the ape, are nowhere found.' (Age and Origin of Man, pp. 55, 56.)"

On p. 194 Wright says: *"The glib manner in which many, not to say most, popular writers, as well as many observers of limited range, speak of the glacial epoch as far distant in geological time, is due to ignorance of facts which would seem to be so clear that he who runs might read them."*

It is generous of Professor Wright to charge the claim by these Evolutionists that man has been on the earth for hundreds of thousands of years to their being "observers of limited range" and to their *"ignorance of the facts."* They will sneer (as usual) at this; but *it was either that or that they wilfully suppress the facts to blind the people*—they are welcome to their choice.

Now, reader, these Evolutionists are continually holding those of us who are exposing them up to ridicule as being ignorant and insincere; they even hold William Jennings Bryan up to scorn (not realizing that "scorn" and "science" are not synonyms, nor that "ridicule" and "reason" are not synonymous) as being ignorant and insincere. Yet these great apostles of Evolution deliberately suppress the facts and state *as a fact,* that man has been on this earth hundreds of thousands of years—why? Because this teaching of Evolution is ruined if man has been on the earth only a few thousand years, and that would mean that the Bible is true, that Christ is Deity and a real Redeemer, and that they must repent and accept Him as Saviour, or go to hell, and they are too "intellectual" to believe in a hell.

"The species have a real existence in nature," says Lyell, "and each was endowed at the time of its creation with the attributes and organs by which it is now distinguished."

"Everything," says Sir Charles Bell, "declares the species to have its origin in a distinct creation, not in a gradual variation from some original type."

Says Dr. Charles Elam: "The hypothesis of natural selection is not directly supported by any single fact in the whole range of natural history or paleontology; but, on the other hand, *every fact which is known with any certainty* in those sciences, so far as it bears upon natural selection, directly opposes it."

"And the elder Professor Agassiz, in words highly prized by every thoughtful Christian, puts the case calmly and strongly: "It is evident that there is a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the

surface of the earth. This progress consists in an increasing similarity to the living fauna, and, among the vertebrates, especially in their increasing resemblance to man. But this connection is not the consequence of a direct lineage between the faunas of different ages. *There is nothing like parental descent connecting them.* The fishes of the Paleozoic age are in no respect the ancestors of the reptiles of the Secondary age; nor does man descend from the mammals which preceded him in the Tertiary age. The link by which they are connected is of a higher and immaterial nature; and their connection is to be sought in the view of the Creator Himself, whose aim in forming the earth, in allowing it to undergo the successive changes which geology has pointed out, and in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away, was to introduce man upon the surface of our globe. Man is the end toward which all the animal creation has tended from the first appearance of the first Paleozoic fishes."

And remember that nothing has been added since these men wrote, *not a single specimen found of one species having evolved from a lower,* but spontaneous generation has been killed; natural selection has been proven false; and it has been proved that acquired characteristics are not inherited.

Prof. William Bateson, the greatest living Biologist, in his presidential address at the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1914: *"We have done with the notion that Darwin came latterly to favor that large differences can arise by accumulation of small differences."*

Where were the Evolutionists when that ton of dynamite was exploded under their idol, their goddess,

Evolution? What is there left? But they will continue for the space of two hours: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" Then they will assume a dignified and learned air and try to look as wise as an owl and say, "All scientists now believe in Evolution." And they will spend money by the hundreds of thousands and dig in the earth and sob and cry and pray, "O Baal, hear us! Let us find the missing link." It's not a missing link they need to find—they need to find a whole chain! Where is there *a single link ever found anywhere, by anybody, between two species?* Echo answers, "Where?" Listen to Darwin: *"When we descend to details we can prove that not one species has changed."*—The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, Vol. 1, p. 210, in letter written to Bentham.

Oh, the Evolutionists will talk learnedly about "the missing link" and all that. In glass case No. 2 in the Hall of the Age of Man, American Museum of Natural History, New York City, is the bust of what they call "the Piltdown man," a "missing link," a "restoration." Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn, in a letter June 1, 1921, to the Editor of the New York Globe, said: "The American Museum of Natural History and the Hall of the Age of Man, to which Alfred W. McCann refers, scrupulously avoid presenting theories, and rest on the solid ground of well ascertained facts." Keeping that positive statement in mind, consider the facts about "the Piltdown Man": About 1909 or 1910 from a gravel bed on a farm near Piltdown Common, England, a laborer found a small piece of unusually thick human parietal bone and gave it to Mr. Charles Dawson, who, on visiting the same spot "some years later" found "another and larger piece of bone belonging to the frontal region of a skull, including a portion of the

ridge extending over the left eyebrow." Both of these fragments, it is said, could be concealed in the palm of one hand. By August, 1913, the Piltdown fragments included two nasal bones and two molar teeth. From those fragments they have reconstructed "the Piltdown man"—just as from *one tooth* recently found in Nebraska they have "reconstructed" the whole being—wonderful science!

But alas for the swindling tricks of the Evolutionists! Prof. Alex Herdlicka, in Smithsonian report, 1913, pp. 491-552, says:

"The most important development in the study of the Piltdown remains is the recent well documented objection by Prof. Gerritt S. Miller of the United States National Museum to the classing together of the lower jaw and the canine with cranium. According to Miller. who had ample anthropoid, as well as human, material for comparison, *the jaw and tooth belong to a fossil chimpanzee.*" But hold on: "the chimpanzee, according to the evidence, never lived in the British Isles in any age." *Who lied and slipped that chimpanzee tooth in as having been found in an English gravel bed, that the "reconstructed" "piltdown man" might appear as "the missing link?"*

Sir Ray Lankester, one of the most distinguished English scientists, from the first said that the jaw and the skull had never belonged to the same creature. Prof. David Waterton, University of London, King's College, confirmed the decision of Sir Ray Lankester, saying, "The mandible was obviously that of a chimpanzee, while the fragments of the skull were human in all their characters."

Prof. George Grant MacCurdy of the Archaeological Department of Yale University in Science, February 18, 1916, said:

"Regarding the Piltdown specimens we have at last reached a position that is tenable. The cranium is human as was recognized by all in the beginning. On the other hand, the mandible and the canine tooth are those of a fossil chimpanzee. This means that in place of Eoanthropos Dawsoni (the Piltdown missing link) we have two individuals belonging to different genera." Yet in 1921 Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn still publishes in his writings pictures of "the Piltdown man." Wouldn't you blush, reader, if thus "caught with the goods"? But these Evolutionists, when exposed, can no more blush than than can a lip-stick flapper.

Of this base imposture the scholarly Catholic physician, James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., says:

"Is not such unwarranted piecing together of discrepant material unworthy even of a petifogging attorney? Such juggling bespeaks the mountebank; not the scientist." Had this kind of work been done by a preacher, he would have been looked upon, and rightly, as a slimy hypocrite, but this High Priest of Evolution can get by with it and remain in good standing—for obvious reasons.

If the reader wishes to see every one of the "reconstructed" "missing links" exposed, let him read "God or Gorilla" by Alfred W. McCann, LL. D.

Prof. John Gerard, in "The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer," after quoting Charles Robin (Dictionaire Encyclopedeque des sciences medicales) as saying "Darwinism is a fiction, a poetical accumulation of probabilities, without proof, and of attractive ex-

planations without demonstration," gives a list of continental scholars who have rejected Darwinism altogether or "admit it only with fatal reservations": M. de Quatrefrages, Blanchard, Wigand, Wolff, Harmann, Pauly, Driesch, Hertwig, Plate, Heer, Kolliker, Eismer von Hartmann, Schilde, Du Bois-Reymond, Nageli, Schaaffhausen, Fechner, Jacob, Diebolder, Huber, Joseph Rouke and Von Bauer.

And yet in the face of these scientists and others quoted in this chapter, the Evolutionists with the innocent, lamb-like look on their faces of a six-year-old girl who comes out in her pinafore and recites, "Mary had a little lamb," will continue to say, "All scientists now accept Evolution." Take, as a sample H. W. Conn: "We find nowhere today any thought of discussing this question any more than discussing the truth of the law of gravitation. . . . Science regards it as beyond discussion and accepts it as a demonstrated conclusion. (Reader, get that word *"demonstrated,"* will you? *When they cannot find a single case!*—T. T. M.) . . . It would probably be impossible to find among modern scientists any one who would venture to hold any other opinion."

But the High Priest of Evolution, Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn, Honorary Curator Department of Vertebrate Paleontology American Museum of Natural History, author of "Men of the Old Stone Age," etc., goes Professor Conn one better, and even includes the preachers: *"The religious men of all churches accept evolution as a fact"*—when right under his nose *while he was making this statement, the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, with offices in the Hartford Building, 22-26 East Fourteenth Street, New York City, was publishing in the metropolitan press at regu-*

lar advertising rates a vigorous denunciation of the so-called scientific theories of man's origin which run counter to the doctrine of creation by God."—God or Gorilla, p. 251. But such base deception, such wilful falsifying as would drive an ignorant preacher from the pulpit, does not hurt the standing of an Evolutionist—for obvious reasons.

But it is claimed that many scientists quoted in this chapter are dead. Fortunate for these Evolutionists that they are dead! Does the fact that they are dead prove that they were not great scientists? Does death prove that they lied? Have living Evolutionists found one single transitional specimen from one species to another? Hasn't natural selection been killed? Hasn't it been proved that acquired characteristics are not inherited? Hasn't it been proved that man has been on this earth less than 15,000 years? But here is a live one, a real live one, understand?

Prof. William Bateson of England, the greatest living Biologist, President the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1914: "Darwin speaks no more with philosophical authority. We read his scheme of evolution as we would those of Lucretius or of Lamarck. . . . Almost the last shred of that teleological fustian with which Victorian philosophers loved to clothe the theory of evolution is destroyed. . . . Do we, as a matter of fact, find in the world about us variations occurring of such a kind as to warrant faith in a contemporary progressive evolution? . . . Till lately most of us would have said, 'yes' without misgiving. The appearance of contemporary variation proves to be an illusion. *WE HAVE DONE WITH THE NOTION THAT DARWIN CAME TO FAVOR,*

THAT LARGE DIFFERENCES CAN ARISE BY ACCUMULATION OF SMALL DIFFERENCES. . . . Modern research lends not the smallest encouragement or sanction to the view that gradual evolution occurs by the transformation of masses of individuals, though *THAT FANCY HAS FIXED ITSELF ON POPULAR IMAGINATION."*—God or Gorilla, pp. 205-208.

"We see no changes in progress around us in the contemporary world which we can imagine likely to culminate in the evolution of forms distinct in the larger sense. By inter-crossing dogs, jackals and wolves new forms of these types can be made, some of which may be species, but I see no reason to think that from such material a fox could be bred in indefinite time or that dogs could be bred from foxes."—William Bateson, quoted in God or Gorilla, p. 285.

Mr. Darwin as quoted by William Jennings Bryan: "The Menace of Darwinism," says: "With savages the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the progress of elimination. We build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed and the sick; we institute poor laws; our medical experts exert their utmost skill to save the lives of every one to the last moment. There is reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands who from weak constitutions would have succumbed to smallpox. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. *No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man."* That is evolution to a dot—"survival of the fittest." "Might makes right." If Evolution is true, and the Bible is not God's word, and the

Saviour not really our Redeemer, where did this building of asyums for the weak, the maimed, the sickk come from? Evoution says: "Let them die." Yet Evolutionists now are insistent on the "social gospel," helping the poor, the sick, etc. *When did Evolution reverse itself?* The efforts of Evolutionists to get around this are pitiable. *Their theory in its logical conclusions, was too blood-raw and they stole these higher principles from the Bible they are trying to destroy and from the Saviour their teaching is branding as the bastard, illegimate son of a fallen woman,* and are trying to masquerade under these high, noble principles as the fruit of their Evolution!

The old legend: The birds decided on a test flight to test which could fly the highest; when all others had become exhausted and stopped in their upward flight, the eagle soared higher and higher. When at last he stopped in his flight, the little wren, which had remained hidden in the feathers on the back of the eagle, sprang out and flew up a few feet and claimed the victory! Poor little hypocrite! But there is your Evolution! Claiming these higher principles, when Evolution teaches just the opposite.

But the question comes up, Why have so many professors and scientists accepted Evolution if it is untrue? Two other questions: Why have so many of the really great scientists repudiated it? Why have great scientists such as Dr. Virchow and Prof. William Max Wundt of Leipsic, who at first accepted it and wrote largely in its defense, given it up and turned against it?

Remember that in 1806 there were eighty theories of so-called science that contradcted the Bible and every one of them have been given up as false.

Let some great men explain how and why men are misled:—

Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn, in "The Origin and Evolution of Life": "In truth, from the period of the earliest stages of Greek thought *man has been eager to discover some natural cause of Evolution, and to abandon the idea of supernatural intervention in the order of nature.*"

Francis Bacon, in "Novum Organum," explains: "If the human intellect hath once taken a liking to any doctrine, either because received and credited or because otherwise pleasing, it draws everything else into harmony with that doctrine, and to its support; and albeit there may be found a more powerful array of contradictory instances, these, however, it does not observe, or it contemns, or by distinction extenuates and rejects them."

Rosseau's description of the philosophers of his day is a pen-picture of the Evolutionsts:

"I have found them proud, positive, dogmatizing, even in their pretended skepticism, knowing everything, proving nothing, and ridiculing one another. There is not one of them who, coming to distinguish truth from falsehood, would not prefer his own error to the truth that is discovered by another.

"Under pretense of being themselves the only people enlightened, they imperiously subject us to their magisterial decisons, and would fain palm upon us, for the true reason of things, the unintelligible systems they have erected in their own heads, while they trample underfoot all that man reveres."

James Martineau says, "The history of knowledge abounds with instances of men who, with the highest

merit in particular walks, have combined with it a curious incompetency."

Prof. G. Schwalbe, the great German anatomist, in "The Early History of Man," puts it truly:

"Probably in no department of natural science is the attempt to draw general conclusions from a number of facts more liable to be influenced by the subjective disposition of the student than in the early history of man. On this subject it often happens that upon a few facts theories are based which are stated with so much conviction as easily to lead those, who have no special knowledge of the subject, to regard them as assured scientific certainties."

Prof. E. G. Conklin, in "The Direction of Human Evolution": "It is not my intenton to argue the truth of the general theory of organc Evolution: the day for that is past." How they wish it was really past! The wish is father to the thought. They first said it is possible; then that it is probable; then therefore it is certain; then, "all scientists now accept Evolution; then "now the day of arguing the truth of it is past." "Methinks the lady doth protest too much."

But Prof. Conklin certainly told one truth when he said: "Narrowness of outlook and intense specialization often make 'learned fools.'" But how came him to make such a confession! And what will his co-Evolutionists think of him for having told on them, too!

Professor Graebner: "The warfare of philosophy against Christian faith is readily explained. Man is corrupt. He loves sin. He is conscious of his guilt and fears the penalty. Hence, every avenue of his escape is welcome, if only he can persuade himself that there

is no God, no judgment. Man is proud, he desires no Saviour. Hence the effort to prove that no Saviour is needed, that there is no guilt attaching to sin, that there is no absolute right and wrong."

"All satanic methods before this have been crude and coarse compared with this last invention. It is the most subtle and sweepng of all evil methods to ensnare the mind of man. Based on what is called science, promoted by the scholars of the day, taught in the fountains of learning and preached from pulpit and platform, it must have a widespread effect. Heretofore attacks on Christianity have been made from without. This is from within. It is the trusted leaders who are now undermining the fortress in which they live."—The Other Side of Evolution, p. 143.

This author is only partly right; only a part of our trusted religious teachers are undermining the fortress; many of our college men and preachers are standing true; but they are asleep to our danger—many of them. But the great betrayal, the great danger is in the teachers in our tax-supported schools and school books. Th great majority of them have gone over to this soul-damning enemy, and they are reaching the great body of our young people at the most susceptible, critical time of their lives.

The President of the American Association of University Professors recently sent out a letter on the "Anti-Evolution" movement, from which Ginn & Co., publishers, in their "What the Colleges Are Doing," for November, 1922, make the following quotation:

"The chief injury is not merely to the professor who loses his position or to the particular institution

that sacrifices a permanent aim to a passing fear. It is in the degradation of the office of teachers in the establishment of distrust and suspicion in the public mind toward all colleges and universities." Who is to blame?

Who is to blame, the sheriff who does not carry out his oath but fosters gambling and bootlegging, or the man who exposes him and drives him from office? Who has degraded the office of teacher, the teachers who have prostituted their office to teaching the most insidious, the most dangerous infidelity the world has ever known, and labelling it "science" when it is not science, and calling it "verified knowledge" as this professor calls it in this letter, bringing it into even the Prmary Department to poison and doom our children, when *they know* that no honest man, woman, boy or girl can believe Evolution is true and at the same time believe the Bible to be really the word of God and the Saviour to be real Deity and a real Redeemer; or those of us who are exposing Evolution and these teachers, traitors to their trust, and trying to save our children from hell? Let them go and build their own schools and teach what they please; let them be paid by those who believe in their disguised infidelity; but after taking the hard-earned money from Methodists and thus stealing Vanderbilt University from them, after taking Baptist money and stealing Chicago University from them, and many other great schools, they have now stolen into our State Universities and State Normals and High Schools and on down into the Primary Departments of our public schools and demand that we pay them with our taxes to doom our children and send them to hell; then when they are exposed they turn sissy and whine that they are being persecuted! "the degra-

dation of the office of teacher!" only those who misuse the office of teacher can really degrade it. Even Juvenal, the heathen, taught "Maxima pueris debitur reverentia" ("The greatest reverence is due youth"), but these Evolutionists palm off their unproven theory as science upon our unsuspecting children and sweep them into hell. What do they care?

This same president says that this fight of "anti-evolution" "discourages free discussion and the research for the truth among its professors and students" —when *he knows* that a boy and girl who dare stand up against Evolution is crushed like an egg-shell, often threatened with failure to graduate if they do not cease their opposition and believe what is taught; when *he knows* that an untrained boy and girl have little chance with a trained professor who has all vantage ground; when *he knows* that these Evolution teachers never tell their classes of the great scientists who reject Evolution, but say, "all scientists accept Evolution!"

CHAPTER VI

The Effects of Evolution on Teachers of It.

IT IS not the purpose of this book to show the effect of Evolution on the lives of the people. It could be shown. When the International Peace Congress assembled in Paris in 1900, L'Univers made this meaningful statement: "The spirit of peace has fled the earth, because Evolution has taken possession of it. The plea for peace in past years have been inspired by faith in the divine nature, and in the divine origin of man; men were then looked upon as children of one Father, and war, therefore was fratricide. But now that men are looked upon as children of apes, what matters it whether they are slaughtered or not?" Witness Germany who believed and taught it. Witness the revelation in the High Schools of St. Louis, Chicago and other cities.

If Evolution is true, the Bible is not God's word. Mr. Huxley saw this. He says: "Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible." Genesis says ten times that everything brought forth "after his kind." Evolution teaches just as positively that all species, from amoeba to man, were evolved, the higher from the lower, "by numerous slight variations for many generations." No intelligent, consistent, honest man can believe both.

But the Saviour endorsed Genesis as the word of God. For Him to endorse those ten lies in the first chapter of Genesis, if Evolution is true, proves that He was not Deity—was not our real Redeemer, was not a God-sent authoritative teacher. With the Bible, as the word of God out of the way, *where is your standard of*

morals? Why not have many wives? Why not have concubines? Where is the authority to say that it is wrong? Why not gratify the sexual nature—why not commit adultery? Where is your authority to say that it is wrong? Suppose these and other things are wrong (But how are we to know what is wrong? Where is your standard when you give up the Bible as God's word and the Saviour as Deity?), what of it? Evolutionists laugh at the idea of there being a hell. And coarseness and lasciviousness are spreading just in the proportion that Evolution is spreading among the people.

But the purpose of this chapter is to show the effects of Evolution on those who teach it.

Witness Mr. Darwin who in early life believed the Bible; witness his own teachings, how they swept him far out to sea and into infidelity; witness how, after sweeping hundreds of thousands away from God and the Bible and the Saviour, after a wasted life, when the chilly winds of death were sweeping around his soul, he turns to the Saviour, as shown at the close of this chapter.

Witness George Romanes, the great Evolutionist, swept from God and the Bible and the Saviour; read the tragedy of his soul in those dark days; then after a misspent life in sweeping others away from God and the Bible and the Saviour, witness him, at life's close, coming back and accepting the Saviour.

Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr sent out a questionnaire to over five thousand scientists, those who stand and teach our sons and daughters, and from the answers he states that over half of them do not believe

in a personal God, nor in the existence of the soul after death; yet almost to a man they once believed the Bible and that Christ was our Saviour, but they were taught Evolution by their teachers. If it has this effect on the teachers, *WHAT WILL IT DO WITH THE STUDENTS?*

Where Evolution is specially taught in our universities and colleges, is in the department of Biology, Psychology and Sociology. It is said that only thirty-six per cent of the Biologists believe in a personal God, and that the soul exists after death; and that only thirty-three per cent of the Psychologists believe in a personal God and the soul existing after death; and only thirteen per cent of the Sociologists; yet they were once believers in God and the Bible and the Saviour, and were taught Evolution by their teachers.

It would take volumes to give the atheistic and infidel utterances of the Evolution professors in American Universities and Colleges. As this is being written there comes to hand the *Literary Digest* of March 3, 1923, in which there is a leading article: "The Growing Philosophic Despair." It begins, "No salvation, no immortality. Nothing but cosmic collapse at the end—this is the philosophic fear which the contemporary literature of despair holds for us." The article tells of a letter written by the lecturer and writer, Albert Edward Wiggam to Glenn Frank, Editor of the *Century Magazine,* concerning this appalling issue. One paragraph will show the effect of Evolution upon those who teach it:

"One of the professors of a large Eastern university," writes Mr. Wiggam, "boldly teaches his students that 'man s a mere cosmic accident,' the most interest-

ing and the most self-interested accident that has yet happened to matter, but nevertheless an accident; that 'immortality is a sheer illusion,' and that 'there is practically no evidence for the existence of God.' At another institution a professor "informs his students, many of them labor leaders and intellectuals of the most earnest type, that 'religion is a mere defense mechanism' which man has built up subjectively, a 'compensatory fiction for his inner feeling of inferiority,' 'a device for importing symbols into the world of fact,' all with a view not of finding reality, but of keeping up his courage with a 'universe run in his private interest,' 'a universe as he would like to have it.'" At still another Eastern university a professor of Psychology tells his students "that 'freedom of the will has been knocked into a cocked hat,' and that such things as the 'soul' and 'consciousness' are mere mistakes of the older psychology.' 'And these,' says Mr. Wiggam, 'are only random examples. It is safe, he thinks, to assert that a 'majority of the Biologists, Psychologists, Physicists, and Chemists are thoroughgoing mechanists, and that mechanism as a world view is growing."

That some escape who teach Evolution is nothing in favor of it, any more than that some escaping in a small-pox epidemic is proof in favor of small-pox.

Prof. E. G. Conklin of Princeton University:

"The modern world had outgrown the primitve religion of tribal gods, whether of the Philistines or the Israelites."—The Direction of Human Evolution, p. 181. Then the God of old the Old Testament is only the tribal god of the Jews. That is a sample of what Evolution does with a learned professor who accepts it, and he is the teacher of young men in a great universty.

Again, Professor Conklin: "The religion of Evolution is nothing new, but is the old religion of Confucius and Plato and Moses and especially of Christ."—The Direction of Human Evolution, p. 246. There you have it! Evolution puts the religion of Christ in the same class with Confucius and Plato. Why not, if Evolution is true, if he endorsed the lies of Genesis as the word of God and He is only, therefore, the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and as a consequence no real Redeemer at all?

"In an editorial in The Commercial Appeal the editor, in discussing the character and Christian faith of the late Hon. Joseph Hodges Choate, after bringing out the fact that Mr. Choate was once shaken in his faith in immortality by reading Darwin's works, but recovered his faith before his death, closed the article with this comment: 'From the foregong it seems clear that the speculations of the scientists named are inconsistent with a belief in immortality; and it seems equally clear to us that if there is no hell there ought to be one for the comfort of those gentlemen and their puny imitators of the present day who so scornfully dominate the intellectual field.' "—Evolution—a Menace, p. 86.

George Romanes, the great Evolutionist, who was swept far out to sea by Evolution, yet who returned and accepted the Saviour shortly before dying, tells his experience: "The views that I entertained on this subject (Plan in Revelation) when an under-graduate (*i. e.*, the ordinary orthordox views) were abandoned in the presence of the theory of Evolution." In this condition he tells us: "I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness; and although from henceforth the precept to 'work while it is day' will doubt-

less gain an intensified force from the terribly intensified meaning of the words that 'the night cometh when no man can work,' yet when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as I now find it, at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible."

Truly Mr. Bryan says: "All the intellectual satisfaction that Darwinism ever brought to those who have accepted it will not offset the sorrow that falls to a single life from which the brute theory of descent has shut out the sunshine of God's presence and the companionship of Christ."

The effect of Evolution on Professor Charles Darwin is well known; how his own teachings wrecked his faith; but his turning to the Saviour in his last illness is not so well known. It is a touching story:

"Lady Hope, a consecrated English woman, speaking before a Northfield audience, August 15, 1915, on Mr. Darwin's religious life, gave the following account of a personal interview that subsequently was published in The Watchman-Examiner. The article, as published, was written by her own hand, and this is what she says:

"It was on one of those glorious autumn afternoons that we sometimes enjoy in England, when I was asked to go in and sit with the well known Professor, Charles Darwin. He was almost bed-ridden for some months before he died. I used to feel when I saw him that his fine presence would make a grand picture for our Royal Academy; but never did I think so more

strongly than on this particular occasion. He was sitting up in bed, wearing a soft-embroidered dressing gown, of rather a rich purple shade. Propped up by pillows, he was gazing out on a far-stretching scene of woods and cornfields, which glowed in the light of one of those marvelous sunsets which are the beauty of Kent and Surrey. His noble forehead and fine features seemed to be lit up with pleasure as I entered the room. He waved his hand toward the window as he pointed out the scene beyond, while in the other hand he held an open Bible, which he was always studying.

"What are you reading now?" I asked, as I seated myself by his bedside.

"Hebrews!" he answered. "The Royal Book, I call it. Isn't it grand?" Then placing his finger on certain passages, he commented on them.

"I made some allusion to the strong opinions expressed by many persons on the history of the creation, its grandeur, and then their treatment of the earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis.

"He seemed greatly distressed, his fingers twitched nervously, and a look of agony came over his face, as he said: 'I was a young man with unformed ideas. I threw out queries, suggestions, wondering all the time over everything; and to my astonishment the ideas took like wildfire. People made a religion of them'.

"Then he paused, and after a few more sentences on 'the holiness of God' and 'the grandeur of this Book', looking at the Bible which he was holding tenderly all the time, he said: 'I have a summer house in the garden, which holds about thirty people. It is over there,' pointing through the open window. 'I want you very much

to speak there. I know you read the Bible in the villages. Tomorrow afternoon I should like the servants on the place, some tenants, and a few of the neighbors to gather there. Will you speak to them?'

"What shall I speak about?" I asked.

"Christ Jesus!" he replied in a clear, emphatic voice, adding in a lower tone, 'and His salvation'. Is not that the best theme? And then I want you to sing some hymns with them. You lead on your small instrument, do you not?"

"The wonderful look of brightness and animation on his face as he said this I shall never forget, and he added; 'If you take the meeting at 3 o'clock this window will be open, and you will know that I am joining in with the singing."—Collapse of Evolution, Revised Edition, pp 62, 63.

Many of your sons and daughters will go to the State Normals and State Universities to become teachers. Here is the effect Evolution is having on the teachers, and they, in turn will go into our public schools to spread the deadly teaching among the boys and girls, young men and women.

Unless Evolution is driven from our tax-supported schools, from primary to university, here are the kind of teachers your children will be trained by; here is what many of your chldren will become.

It is a sad, a tragic picture, the meeting of the Evolution teachers with their pupils in hell whom they damned by instilling their Bible-destroyng, Chrst-denying poison into their souls. Sneer at this? Of course they will; for sneers and sarcasm are the only arguments of guilty souls. But in hell, their eternal home, there are no sneers—no sarcasm.

CHAPTER VII

Effects of Evolution on Students.

GERMANY'S "superman" turned out to be an incarnate devil; but before that stage was reached, Evolution swept the young men and women, boys and girls of Germany from the Bible as God's word and from Jesus the Christ as Saviour and Redeemer. Some professors, as mental contortionists, by theological flimflamming, or by getting up a special brand of Evolution, kind of "home brew" for private consumption, may believe in Evolution and also in the Bible as God's word and Christ as Saviour and real Redeemer; but your open-minded student cannot.

Robert Blatchford, the prominent English writer, in "God and My Neighbor" on page 159 says: "But—no Adam, no Fall (he's right.—T. T. M.), no Fall, no Atonement (he's right.—T. T. M.); no Atonement, no Saviour (he's right.—T. T. M.). Accepting Evolution how can we believe in a Fall (let any honest man answer.—T. T. M.)? When did Man Fall? Was it before he ceased to be a monkey or after? Was it when he was a Tree Man or later? Was it in the Stone Age, or the Bronze Age or the Age of Iron?—And, if there never was a Fall, why should there be an Atonement?" And any open-minded student can see that. And when one has given up the Atonement, only hell is left.

"The Fall of Man was the passing of the non-moral man to the moral man."—Professor Shailer Mathews of Chicago University. Then man only fell upward. Then man at first was not moral, only a brute, and there was no fall; therefore God's word lies about it. Then there is no real Redeemer needed. *And that is Evolution.*

And this is the man who comes South fishing for suckers by preaching "orthodoxy," and this is the school from which many of our tax-supported schools get teachers to teach our children and turn them from faith in the Bible as God's word and in the Saviour as their Redeemer, and send them into outer darkness for eternity.

The Hon. Thomas Dwight, professor of Anatomy in Harvard University, puts it clearly: "One of our greatest curses has been the atheistic popular lecturer, the purveyor of sham science on the one hand and the hater of religion on the other. He spreads about the wildest theories as established facts, claiming that the whole social fabric, religion and all, should be remodeled to suit the new revelation. He does not know whether there is a God or not; but he does know that man came from the ape. . . . The mischief that such men do, is great indeed. The young man sees the popular lecturer praised and flattered, is dazzled by his plausibility and brilliancy. The plain fact that his hero is but a quack does not occur to him."

Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan states: "During the last half century, the Darwinian doctrine has been the means of shaking the Faith of millions."

"There is an abundant evidence that the teaching of these text-books is unsettling the faith of thousands of students. Many of these, through respect for their parents' faith, say but little, while many others are outspoken in their rejection of the Bible account of creation."—"Evolution—A Menace," p 84.

J. W. Porter, the great Kentucky preacher and lecturer, gives this testimony: "In a recent lecture on

Evolution, three broken-hearted mothers told the writer of the wrecking of their children's faith, by this ruinous teaching. In a recent meeting of our State Board, a prominent business man wept as he told of the damage done his daughter's faith by this teaching." What is one soul worth? What will pay for sending one soul to hell? But what do these Evolutionists care for this? They will laugh and sneer at it. Having believed and taught that they have the blood of beasts in their veins, they now have the heart of a brute, for "as he thinketh in his heart so is he."

"L. W. Munhall the noted Methodist Evangelist, cites a number of instances where parents with tear-dimmed eyes, have told him of how they have sent their children to Methodist schools for the purpose of strengthening the faith that was in them, to find them graduating at last, confirmed infidels. Without apology he mentions the Wesleyan University of Middleton, Conn., the University of Boston, the University of Syracuse and other outstanding Methodist institutions. He reports a Bishop's daughter who declared that at the Boston University her faith was destroyed and it took her six months after returning to her home to feel that she was back on the rock Christ; and she declared that her experience was a common one with the girls of that college."—The Menace of Modernism, pp 115-116.

Professor Leuba states that he questioned students from nine colleges and that 15% of the Freshmen had given up the Christian religion, 30% of the Juniors, and 45% of the graduates. It is in proportion as they are taught Evolution—the higher the class, the more Evolution is taught.

During twenty-two years as an Evangelist throughout the country, I have met with many cases, young

men and women having been taught Evolution in the schools, now having only contempt and scorn for the Bible and for Jesus the Christ as Saviour and Redeemer; broken-hearted fathers and mothers weeping over the wrecked faith of their children. What care the Evolutionists for all this? They laugh and jeer, as the rapist laughs and jeers at the bitter tears of the crushed father and mother over the blighted life of their child. But the rapist laughs and jeers over the wrecked, blighted human body; the Evolutionist professors laugh and jeer over a doomed, damned human soul; and they hide behind their smoke-screen that their Evolution teaches that there is no hell. Their "culture," you know—they are the "intellectuals," you know,—teaches them that there is no hell. They'll find out—when too late. One of their apostles, E. G. Conklin, Professor of Biology in Princeton University, in his book, "The Direction of Human Evolution," voices their attitude: "Everywhere intellectual classes (ahem!—T. T. M.) are breaking away from old traditions" (ahem!—T. T. M.) "Intellectual classes!" "Old traditions!" Those who do not accept Evolution are not of the "Intellectual classes." Poor Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, Sir Robt. Anderson, Sir David Brewster, Louis Agassiz, Lord Kelvin, Louis Pasteur, John A. Broadus, Dr. Howard Kelly of Johns Hopkins, Pres. E. Y. Mullins, Prof. Alfred Fairhurst, Prof. Geo. McCready Price, the scientist, Geo. Frederick Wright, Philip Mauro the lawyer, Alfred W. McCann, L.L. D., the lawyer, Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan (of course!) and a host of others. They are not of the "intellectual classes" and are simply holding to "old traditions." You men go way back and sit down with little Mose and be very meek and humble; for you are not of the "Intellectual

classes." Talk about the cheek of a government mule! —he hangs his head in humiliation and chagrin in the presence of such Evolutionists.

As a sample, one from many, of what is being done, here is a letter from a mother to me, dated March 24, 1922: "My son became a Christian about ten years ago. A few weeks before he graduated from ———— University (a Baptist University.—T. T. M.), they let an Evolutionist lecture there for one week (they did not "let" him, they invited him so as to be considered "broad," "liberal," "up-to-date"—T. T. M.), and my son attended the lectures; and since then he seems to have no use for the Bible and takes no interest in the Lord's cause. It almost breaks my heart." And that Baptist President of the University and those Baptist Professors sat there and let that young man's faith and life be wrecked without one word of protest, without one word explaining Evolution, for it is easily exposed; and then they will go out among the common people and talk about "loyalty to the denomination," and about "our great kingdom work" and stir the people with their eloquence and pathos about the "precious old Book" and "the blessed Saviour" and "the Cross" and "the atonement"—and then with a shrug of the shoulders and a wink of the eye, go back to their professorships with the thought, "my job, my salary, is safe for another year or two!"—when they know that no man can reconcile Evolution with the ten-times-repeated statement of Genesis that every thing brought forth "after his kind" and the Saviour endorsing Genesis as the word of God, and His Deity.

Take another example of the effects of Evolution upon students, that comes from a great denominational university:

"I really believe that God sent us up here (the writer was attending a meeting away from the University), because I needed Mr. ————'s preaching more than anything else in the world. I have been taught such terrible things in that Bible class at ———— University that I was really unsettled on some things. It was taught so subtly and in such a way as to make you think that it was all to the glory of Christ, when it was not at all.

"Mr. ———— has straightened me out on a good many things, and I am not going back into that Bible class. I am just going to tell the Dean that if he can't give me something to take the place of the Bible, I do not have to have my degree and can go ahead and take what I want to. But you will never know how thankful I am that I went up to ————. It absolutely saved me, because in another term of that stuff I'd be gone world without end, and no one knows it better than I do. You all can never know what I was up against. Mr. ———— (professor) would sit their and pick out contradiction after contradiction and give the very references so we could see the faults, errors and contradictions right before our eyes. I was not afraid to stick to what I believed, but when he stuck those things before me and asked how I could believe that the Bible was literally inspired, when I could see for myself the errors, I just did not know what to think. He told us that we could blindly go on believing the Bible was absolutely infallible and just shut our eyes to the errors, or else we could face things as they stand and have a religion that can stand all tests. With it all he was so earnest and sincere and seemed to be such a true, consecrated Christian, that he had me up in the air. I was just about gone, and Mr. ———— saved me. Mr. ———— gave me absolute proof of some things that Mr. ———— (the professor) hooted at and said were impossible. Oh, mother and daddy, for goodness sake, don't send the boys to ———— University. I was conceited enough to think that it wouldn't hurt me, and that I could sit through that stuff and come out unharmed, but oh, what a fool I was. As it is, it will take me some time to get over it. But please, oh, please, don't send the boys there. They can't stand it any more than I can. You get the same teaching in sociology, in history, in psychology and in biology. Everything is teeming with it, and it is so subtle you can hardly detect it. I think I am all right now, and on the right road again. But if I find myself slipping like I did this last term I'm just going to quit! It's too dangerous to fool with things like this.

"Now, I know this has worried you, but don't let it too much. Only, *don't send the boys there to* ——— *University.* I think I'll be able to steer clear this term. But if I don't, I'm going to quit, because, I'll tell you, I *was almost gone.* It makes me tremble now to think of how far I had gone and thinking all the time that it was Christ leading me, when it was the *devil.*"

If it is this bad in a denominational school, what will it be in tax-supported schools?

The brilliant Editor of the great daily, The Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., says in an Editorial, *"We have found but a single young person who has returned from college in the last decade who was not an outspoken disciple of Darwin and from the discretion with which he spoke, we have grave doubts about him."*

The President of one of our largest State Universities said, in a printed speech as quoted by Mr. Bryan, "If you cannot reconcile religion with the things taught in biology, in psychology, or in other branches of study in this university, you should throw your religion away. Scientific truth is here to stay." And alas! many of them will "throw your religion away," and you are paying the taxes to have it done.

Mr. Bryan states in his book, "In His Image" that a professor in the University of Wisconsin taught his class that the Bible was a collection of myths; that in the great University at Ann Arbor, Michigan, a Professor argued with the students against religion, and asserted that no thinking man believed in God or the Bible; that at Columbia University a Professor began his course in Geology by telling his class to throw away all that they had learned in the Sunday Schools; that there is a professor in Yale, of whom it is said that no one ever leaves his class a believer in God; that a father, a Congressman, states that his daughter on her return from Wellesley told him that nobody believed in the Bi-

ble stories now; that another, a Congressman, told of a son whose faith was undermined by the doctrine of Evolution, taught in a Divinity School; that three preachers told him of their children returning from college with their faith shaken. Mr. Bryan says that all these and others came to him within a year.

Several brilliant young Baptist preachers, taught Evolution in High School and College, have recently gone into the Unitarian ministry, because they could not, as honest men, believe in Evolution and at the same time believe in the Deity of the Saviour, and hence in real redemption through his dying for our sins.

A lot more of Baptist, Episcopalian, Congregationalist, Methodist, Presbyterian and other preachers ought to go into the Unitarian ministry—but they cannot get as good salaries as they can by masquerading in the pulpits of these Christian pulpits.

"We have known quite a number of young people who have been turned into infidels or semi-infidels through the teaching of Evolution in our colleges and universities."—The Presbyterian, January 11, 1923.

A large percentage of the boys and girls who go from Sunday School and church to college, never return to religious work. Mr. Bryan says sometimes as high as 75%.

Yet, fathers and mothers pay the taxes that pay the salaries of these professors to doom and damn eternally their own children, when everyone of these professors can be driven from every tax-supported school, from primary to University, if the fathers and mothers will only arouse themselves and do their duty.

As another example of what is being done, read the following personal letter to a friend of mine:

May 8, 1921.

"Dear Sir:

"I was the son of a Christian mother; went to college, was taught by infidel teachers, studied Evolution, New Thought, under men like ————, traveled extensively, came home, insulted my old mother; went the primrose route, and today I am a mental, spiritual, and physical wreck. My soul is a starving skeleton; my heart a petrified rock; my mind is poisoned and as fickle as the wind, and my faith as unstable as water. I broke the heart of my mother, disappointed my friends, stood before my class on graduation day, delivered the valedictory address, lauded 'Darwin's Theory' to the skies, and other things I can never recall. I have run the gauntlet, I am at the end of the rope. Oh, wretched man that I am. There is no rest, happiness, or peace for me. I sometimes think I will jump overboard and end it all. I wish I had never seen a college; I hope you will warn the young men of the impending danger just ahead of them. I may be beyond hope, but on this glorious Mother's Day, I wish to testify that Mother was right, and yearn for her Saviour, Jesus Christ, to be mine. And I call upon you and your great church, who I learn, still believe in the old Bible, and the power of prayer to save, to pray that I may be saved under the blood of Christ and reunited with Mother in the Heavenly Kingdom.

(Signed)" A Mother's Son."

That touching tragedy of a blighted doomed soul!

The insidious, blighting curse is upon us; and our children, by wholesale, are being swept away from God, from God's word, from the Redeemer and Saviour, out into outer darkness, to eternal doom, and we are consenting to it, and paying for it with our taxes.

CHAPTER VIII

The Only Hope.

WHAT can be done? Where is our hope? The pussy-footing apologies for the Evolutionists will say "Don't do anything drastic. Educate the people, and the thing will right itself." Educate the people? How can we, when Evolutionists have us by the throat? When they have, while we were asleep, captured our tax-supported schools from primary to University, and many of our denominational colleges? "The Philistines be upon thee Samson!" But alas! We have been asleep upon the lap of this Delilah and have been shorn of our strength—they have captured our schools. But "O Lord God, remember me, I pray thee, and strengthen me, I pray thee, strengthen me only this once, O God." "And Samson took hold of the two middle pillars upon which the house stood, and on which it was borne up." So could we. "And he bowed himself with all his might." So can we. And the strength of God who "created man in his own image" will come into us, and we will slay these Philistines, the greatest curse that has come upon man since God created him in His own image. What is a war, what is an epidemic that sweeps people away by the hundred thousand, compared to this scourge that under the guise of "science," when it is not science, at all, is sweeping our sons and daughters away from God, away from God's word, taking from them their Redeemer and Saviour, to spend eternity in hell?

The two pillars are:

First, the local Board of Trustees of every public school. They are absolutely sovereign. Even the Gov-

ernor of the State, even the President of the United States, cannot force any teacher upon any public school. It is in the hands of the local Board of Trustees. Let the fathers and mothers see that only men and women shall be put on Boards of Trustees who will protect our children from this scourge, this "scholastic paganism." It can be done in two ways:—first, employ no teacher who believes in Evolution; second, obligate every teacher to post himself and expose the claims of Evolution every time it comes up in the text books that are being used, for many of them are poisoned with it. This can be easily done. At the close of this book a list of books will be given that will enable the teachers to combat this deadly-damning curse.

Second, elect to the legislatures men who will cut off all support from all tax-supported schools where Evolution is taught, and require that in all tax-supported schools only teachers shall be employed who will post themselves and combat this terrible curse every time it comes up in the text books being used. Too drastic? Do you fight a scourge of small-pox with halfway measures? A scourge of small pox and yellow fever combined would be slight, as a curse, compared to this scourge that is sweeping our young men and women, boys and girls, away from God, away from God's word, away from the Redeemer-Saviour and into hell for eternity.

Instead of being misled by these worshippers of this modern Diana of the Ephesians, who at the above suggestions will throw dust into the air, and, full of wrath, will cry out, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!", will the reader listen even to an infidel?

I quote from Prof. Alfred Fairhurst, M. A., D. Sci., in "Theistic Evolution," p 73: "Professor Virchow of

Berlin, who was styled the 'foremost chemist of the globe' and who was the highest German authority in physiology, said, *'It is all nonsense.* It cannot be proved by science that man descended from the ape *or from any other animal* (italics mine.—T. T. M.) Since the announcement of the theory, all real scientific knowledge has proved in the opposite direction. The attempt to find the transition from animal to man *has ended in total failure.* (Italics mine.—T. T. M.) Virchow went so far as to denounce the theory *AS DANGEROUS TO THE STATE,* and demanded *THAT IT BE EXCLUDED FROM THE SCHOOLS'." REMEMBER THAT DR. VIRCHOW WAS AN INFIDEL, THAT HE FIRST ACCEPTED THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION, AND WROTE VIGOROUSLY IN ITS FAVOR, AND THIS COMES FROM HIM AFTER HE HAD REPUDIATED EVOLUTION AND KNEW OF ITS DANGERS.* He demanded that it be excluded from the schools because of its effect on this life. How much more urgent that it be excluded when it dooms the soul for eternity!

Prof. Fairhurst, professor of Natural Science in Kentucky University: "Why the public money should be spent to propagate this kind of teaching is beyond my imagination. I believe that the public, when informed, will see that this teaching which is being protected by the word 'science', but which lacks entirely the character of true science, will be banished from our public schools." "The religious public looks on with indifference while their children are being taught this doctrine, not knowing that it is a theory that undermines the Bible and all revealed religion." "And so the dogma, evolution, is being widely propagated in our high schools, and, in some places, in the grades below,

and in our normal schools, among the thousands of immature girls and boys who are to become the teachers of our common schools, who will teach it dogmatically as they have received it from their dogmatic teachers. These teachers are especially fond of dwelling on what they regard as the evolution of man from some animal ancestor, and of connecting him with the brute creation, both in his physical and mental being."

Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., Editorial: "The whole matter comes to this: that responsible leaders should look the question squarely in the face and definitely adopt one course or the other. A policy of drifting will ruin anything. And we venture to say that if one will embody the doctrines of Darwinian Evolution in a resolution to be presented to the various Christian bodies that it will be voted down by every synod, association, conference or other official body in the South. If this be true, then ought a company of self-important leaders be permitted to accomplish by direction what they could not do openly?"

"When the Christian people of this country understand the ravages of agnosticism caused by the substitution of the unsupported guesses for the word of God, they will compel the atheists and agnostics to build their own schools instead of using the public schools for the spread of unbelief."—Wm. Jennings Bryan.

CHAPTER IX

The Responsibility of Fathers and Mothers for Evolution Being Taught to Their Children.

Fathers and Mothers!

DO YOU remember the first faint cry from a tiny little life, when the doctor told you that you were a parent? Can you ever forget the thrill, the inexpressible joy? No language can ever describe it. Did you realize then that there was a being whom you had brought into existence who would spend eternity in Heaven or in hell? Do you realize it now? Do you realize your responsibility for the eternal destiny of that child? Do not hide behind excuses; do not try to shirk responsibility; do not, as the ostrich, when about to be captured, who sticks his head in the sand, to avoid capture, try to escape by sticking your head in the sands of infidelity and saying you do not believe there is any hell. There is as much evidence for believing there is a hell as for believing there is a heaven. Many books will convince you that there is a heaven and a hell. If you will get and read honestly John Urquhart's "Wonders of Prophecy," or Walker's "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," you will realize that there is a heaven and a hell, and that your child will spend eternity in one or the other.

Do you realize not only the duty but the privilege of keeping out of your child's life every influence that could possibly lead to its spending eternity in hell, and of putting into its life every possible influence that would lead to its spending eternity in heaven?

Do you not yearn, *yearn*, YEARN, *YEARN*, yearn with an *inexpressible* yearning, to do everything in your

power to prevent your child spending eternity in hell?

Reader, if you are not a parent, do you not yearn intensely to turn my child, your neighbor's child, your enemy's child, from spending Eternity in hell? Were even your enemy's house on fire, would you stand by in indifference and let his child be burned alive? Yet that child's being burned alive is as nothing when compared to that child's spending eternity in hell. You would go to the limit in helping to rescue the child from the burning building. Isn't saving a soul from spending eternity in hell ten million times more important than saving a human body from a burning building?

If the one who does not accept Jesus Christ as Redeemer and Saviour does not spend eternity in hell, then God, who has given us over six hundred fulfilled prophecies to prove that the Bible is really God's word, has put in that Bible the lie that "the wicked shall be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God," Psalms 9:17.

If the one who does not accept Jesus Christ as Redeemer and Saviour does not spend eternity in hell, then the New Testament lies when it says "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."—John 3:36.

But what have the High Schools of the land to do with the child spending eternity in hell? Many books being taught in the High Schools teach Evolution—that all species or kinds of beings, from the smallest insects up to man, have developed, evolved, from the lower species up to the higher; that the first living thing, not as large as the point of the finest needle, only one one-hundred-and-twentieth part of an inch in diam-

eter, multiplied for ages, each generation differing very slightly, until a new species or kind was evolved, developed; and that this process continued till at last man was evolved; that the first man was "midway between the anthropoid ape and modern man;" that the first man did not speak a plain language, but chattered as animals in trees, having only exclamation of pain or pleasure. If this is true, then Jesus Christ was the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, not Deity, not really God's son, not really our Redeemer and Saviour at all; for three reasons: ten times in the first chapter of Genesis there is the positive statement that everything brought forth *"AFTER HIS KIND."* If Evolution is true, that each brought forth, not "after his kind," but differing slightly till there was evolved a new kind, a new species; then there are ten lies in the first chapter of Genesis. Then the first chapter of Genesis says that God made the first man in His own image; but Evolution says that that is another lie, that the first man was "midway between the anthropoid ape and modern man." Then, Genesis states positively that the first man spoke in a plain language, but Evolution states that that is another lie in Genesis, that the first man did not have a plain language but only chattered as animals, having only exclamations of pain or pleasure. Now the Sviour endorsed Genesis as the word of God. These twelve lies *COULD NOT BE THE WORD OF GOD.* If, when the Saviour endorsed Genesis as the word of God, He knew there were twelve lies in it, then He was not Deity, not really God's Son, but a vile liar and deceiver, and only the illegitimate, bastard son of a fallen woman; and not our Redeemer and Saviour. If these twelve statements are lies (and they are, if Evolution is true) and the Saviour did not know it

when He endorsed Genesis as the word of God, then He was a goody-goody ignoramus and fool, who honestly thought that He was God's Son, when He was only the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and not Deity, not God's Son, not our real Redeemer and Saviour at all—and we are left in our sins. There is no escaping these conclusions by any honest man or woman, boy or girl who accepts Evolution as the truth. Some boys and girls who are taught Evolution in the High Schools, and believe its teachings to be true, may not think clearly, and may continue to believe in the Bible and in the Saviour; but those who are taught it and believe it, and who think clearly, will be forced to give up the Bible and the Saviour as real Redeemer. From respect for the feelings of their Christian fathers and mothers, of their pastors, and of Christians generally, they may not come out frankly and declare their convictions; but they *cannot* accept as Deity a being who would endorse twelve lies as the word of God; then, if He was not Deity, He was no real Redeemer at all, and we have no Saviour and are left in our sins.

"If cosmic theistic evolution is accepted and pushed to its logical results, the Bible as the inspired book of authority in religion will be eliminated. Ths matter is fundamental in the moral and religious life of the world."—Alfred Fairhurst, A. M., D. Sci., Intro. to Theistic Evolution, p 8.

The boasted builders of the Titanic boasted that it could not sink, and great throngs crowded on it and defied God that Sunday night with their revelry and sin; but the horrible death struggles in those icy waters bore tragic testimony to their fearful deception. The boasted builders of your Titanic, Evolution,

are causing thousands to crowd on board, but as certain as God is God the fearful iceberg is ahead, and many will sink beneath the gloomy waves of hell, and you fathers and mothers are to blame.

It is in your power to save your children from this deadly, soul-destroying teaching. The Baptist, Catholic, Congregational, Disciple, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian and other fathers and mothers can, in twelve months, drive Evolution out of every tax-supported school in America and out of every denominational school. Will they do it?

Is there a father whose heart was never touched with the wailing of David when told of his son Absolom: "O my son, Absolom, my son, my son Absolom! Would God I had died for thee, O Absolom, my son, my son!" But the death of a son is nothing compared to a son dying unredeemed, without a Saviour, to spend eternity in hell; yet the fathers and mothers of America, some to appear "broad and liberal," some to appear "up-to-date," some, because brow-beaten by these Evolutionist high-brows and their pussy-footing apologists and defenders, are standing silently by while our children are being eternally damned. As I said in the beginning of this book, the Germans who poisoned the wells and springs of northern France and Belgium that the little children might drink and die, were angels compared to the text-book writers and publishers who are poisoning the books used in our schools that our children who go there to drink in a little learning, may have their souls poisoned and sent down to eternal death; that the Germans who poisoned candy and poured it out from aeroplanes that the starving Belgian and French children might eat it and die, were angels compared to the

teachers, paid by our taxes, who feed our children's minds with the deadly, soul-destroying poison of Evolution. But the Belgian and French mothers and fathers who could have prevented the wells and springs being poisoned and the poisoned candy from being scattered, who could have prevented their children from drinking and eating and dying, and would not have done it, would have been equally guilty with the Germans. And the father and mother, who will stand by, and not go to the limit to protect their children from the soul-destroying poison of Evolution, are equally guilty with the text-book writers and publishers and the Evolution professors in our schools.

CONCLUSION

LET IT be kept clearly in mind that this is not an appeal to have religion taught in the schools supported by taxation. It ought to be taught there; man has body, mind and soul; our State schools are educating the body and the mind, but not the soul, and our tax-supported schools are leaving the soul untrained. As a result, as Prof. Eby has shown, the poorer denominational schools have put nearly nine times as many in "Who's Who in America" as the State schools. This could be corrected by allowing the different denominations a period each day to teach religion in the different class rooms at their own expense; the pupils who do not wish this study, to study that period in the study hall under the eye of a teacher.

But the book is a protest against, after shutting the Bible and religion out of the tax-supported schools, having anti-religion taught; it is a protest against turning over our tax-supported schools to the insidious teaching and drilling into our children the most insidious, most attractive, most dangerous and soul-destroying infidelity with which the world has ever been cursed.

One of the leading Editors of the South, R. K. Maiden, of the *Word and Way*, of Kansas City, recently published an editorial on "*Evolution Means Revolution*:" "It is not to raise a false alarm to proclaim even from the housetop, that we are face to face with a real crisis. The observing and thoughtful among us must be aware that conditions are critical. We must reap what we sow. And we are now reaping a harvest of infidelity from a creedless sowing of former years. While we have been sleeping the enemy has been diligently and supperticiously sowing tares. The crisis to which we refer is the field of education—secular, religious and Christian education. For many years there has been going on an infiltration of rationalism. The effects are revolutionary. Starting with Evolution as a working basis, the evolutionary hypothesis has been long enough and in ways enough applied for us to begin to see that evolution ultimately and inevitably means revolution.

"Beginning back forty or fifty years ago, German rationalism began to find its way into the schools of learning of our country. University professors became interested in German philosophy and attended German Universities. Graduates of Ger-

man universities were sought as teachers in our universities. Soon the leaven of rationalism began to spread. Men infected with rationalism and accepting the hypothesis of evolution as a working basis, became the writers of text books—text books on astronomy, biology, physiology, psychology, sociology and related subjects. In this way the germs of rationalism have been broadcasted. Things have gone on until now many, if not all, of our state universities, together with other universities, have become hotbeds of rationalism. The writers of our text books used in our public schools are mostly Evolutionists. Many of our public school principals and teachers are Evolutionists. They got their rationalistic ideas from the universities in which they have studied. So we are confronted with the serious situation of having the children of our country inoculated with the virus of Evolution.

"In our headline we say 'Evolution Means Revolution'. About this there can be no sort of doubt. We have seen enough and know enough of the effects of the teaching of Evolution to know that to the extent to which it becomes prevalent and dominant it will be revolutionary. We have come to see that those who accept evolution as a hypothesis do not think of God as necessary to their scheme of things. Christ is not allowed any higher place than that of a pure and noble man. Where the credibility and authority of the Bible are not denied, they are discredited. The evolutionist acknowledges no external authority. His evolutionary theory makes useless, if not impossible, miracles and the supernatural. Doesn't this spell revolution of the most radical and tragic kind?"

This Editor explains exactly how Evolution has been fastened on us. It now has us by the throat. *Our only hope* is another revolution—drive these evolution teachers from every tax-supported school, through the local Boards of Trustees, and by electing legislators who will cut off all support from all tax-supported schools where it is taught; then, until we can have prepared proper text books for the schools (for they have us by the throat in the text books and the text book publishers) require every teacher in every tax-supported school to become posted on Evolution and expose it whenever it comes up in the books used.

If the Boards of Trustees of the denominational colleges choose to be traitors to their trust and allow it taught in those colleges, and if some of the presidents and professors of these

denominational colleges will continue to deceive and say that Evolution is not being taught in them, when it is; and if these denominations continue the dupes of their pussy-footing editors who are apologists for and defenders of the Evolutionists, and will leave their denominational colleges as dumping-grounds for their rottenness, let them do it; but the honest, God-fearing taxpayers of this country need to realize the terrible, Bible-destroying, Christ-denying, soul-destroying scourge that is being spread among their children, which they are being forced to pay for with their money, and arouse themselves, and in their American manhood drive this thing from our tax-supported schools. God pity the fathers and mothers who will be brow-beaten and turned from their duty by these educational high-brows, and allow themselves to be scourged into submission and subjection by these Evolutionists and their bat-like, pussy-footing apologists and defenders. The bat, in the presence of animals, will crawl on its feet and pretend to be an animal and thus stand in with the animals; then in the presence of the birds, they will fly and pretend to be birds, and thus stand in with the birds. They are awfully orthodox out among the common, every-day Christian men and women, and talk about "our sacred Bible" and "our precious Saviour" and "the precious blood of Christ" and that "God created man in His own image," and that everything brought forth "after his kind"—and then turn and train with the Evolutionists; the one makes secure their salaries, the other maintains their standing and dignity as being "modern men," "up-to-date," as having shaken off "the old traditions" and being possessors of the "new knowledge," when *they know* that Evolution teaches that everything *did not* bring forth "after his kind,' that God *did not* create man in His own image; when they *know* that if Evolution is true, and the Saviour endorsed Genesis as the word of God, it makes Him out as only the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and leaves the world without a real Redeemer.

Let the reader notice this parallel as given by Patterson in "The Other Side of Evolution":

THE BIBLE ACCOUNT

(Gen. 1:26, 27. 2:7. V:1, 2.)

"And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness. * * * * * And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them.

* * * * * And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. * * * * * In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him; male and female created He them; and blessed them and called their name Adam."

EVOLUTION'S ACCOUNT

(From Darwin's Descent of Man, II, 372.)

"Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arborial in its habits and an inhabitant of the Old World. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a naturalist, would have been classed among the quadrumana, as surely as would the common and still more ancient progenitor of the Old and New monkeys. The quadrumana and all the higher mammals are probably derived from an ancient marsupial animal, and this through a long line of diversified forms, either from some reptile-like or some amphibian-like creature, and this again from some fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of the past we can see that the early progenitor of the Vertebrata must have been an aquatic animal, provided with branchia, with the two sexes united in the same individual."

That is Evolution. No honest man who has three ideas above an oyster can say he believes both of those accounts. "How any one can accept both accounts passes all understanding. The late Dr. Henry Barrows, president of Oberlin University, tells of meeting a Hindu boy in his visit to India, who had attended the mission schools and learned there the shape of the earth. He had, of course, previously been taught the Hindu cosmogony that the earth was surrounded by salt water and that by a circle of earth and that by successive circles of buttermilk, sweet cane juice, and other "soft drinks" with intervening circles of land. Dr. Barrows asked the boy which belief he would hereafter hold. He replied that he would believe both."—He was a "theistic Evoluutinoist."

"The Bible can no longer speak with unquestioned authority. Poor old Adam disappears * * * * * Christ's divinity is only such as we may possess * * * * * the atonement is only such as we see in all life and nature * * * * * As to the future life we find ourselves very much in the dark * * * * * We no longer regard go-

ing to heaven as the center of our interest."—Theodore D. Bacon, Evolutionist." That's honest; that's open and above board.

"It is a fearful and wonderful picture they give us of the origin of marriage from the battles of baboons; of the rights of property established by terrible fights for groves of good chestnuts; of the beginning of morals from the instincts of brutes, and of the dawnings of religion, or rather of superstition, from the dreams of these animals; the result of the whole being that civilization and society and law and order and religion are all simply the evolution of the instincts of the brutes, and that there is no necessity for the invoking any supernatural interference to produce them."—Robert Patterson in "Fables of Infidelity." That is Evolution. If that is true and the Bible is not God's revelation to man, where is the sin of sex relations outside of marriage? If sex relation was no sin among baboons, nor in the next generation, nor in the next, where on up to man was the line crossed that made sex relations outside of marriage a sin? Who had a right to say it is a sin, if the Bible is not God's word? Where is the sin of capital crushing labor if Evolution is true? It was not a sin for baboons, by force, to overpower other baboons and take a grove of good chestnuts; nor in the next generation; nor in the next; where, on up to man, did we cross the line and it become a sin? Who said it was sin, if the Bible is not God's word? Suppose these things are sin, what of it, if the Bible is not God's word and there is no hell? (And Evolutionists laugh and sneer at the idea of there being a hell).

God pity the fathers and mothers who will let sentiment take the place of reason and duty and not drive Evolution from our schools because the Evolutionists will turn "sissy" and play the "baby act" and whine "persecution!" "They burned Servetus at the stake!" "They made Galileo recant." That is a fine defense for a man who claims to be a man, to make, isn't it? A man can come into our schools and teach that the Bible is not God's word, and we musn't say a word, or "they burned Servetus at the stake." He can teach that the Saviour was the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman, and a goody-goody ignoramus or a vile liar and deceiver, and we must let it be taught to our children, or, "they burned Servetus at the stake!" They can rob our children of a real Saviour, and send them from this life into "outer darkness," into Eternal night, into hell, and if we dare protest, "they burned Servetus at the stake!" God pity the

fathers and mothers who will let sentiment take the place of reason and duty and let their taxes continue to pay the salaries of these men to damn our children with Evolution simply because they call it "science" when there is no science in it; and send them to hell, and we, poor slaves, pay the expenses, their salaries, with our taxes.

"But," says someone, "don't you believe in liberty?" Certainly, but let these Evolutionists teach in schools that they, or those who believe like them, have established with their own money, and not in the schools established by the taxes, the hard-earned money, of Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists and Presbyterians and others; let their salaries be paid by men who believe in their pseudo-science, their damning, soul-destroying Evolution, and not force Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists and Presbyterians and others to pay their salaries; let them teach those who want to be damned by their heathen philosophy, and let it not be forced upon our children, simply because the Bible is not allowed in our public schools; they have no right, because of this, to steal into our public schools and destroy the Bible and destroy Christian belief. As Wm. Jennings Bryan puts it, if we cannot have religious teaching in our public schools, if we cannot have the Scriptures taught in our public schools, we certainly do not pay our taxes to have anti-religion taught, to have religion destroyed. *If the State is not to teach religion, it is certainly not to tear down religion. It is just as much a violation of the constitution to tear down religion as it would be to teach religion.*

Some hooded man, disguised, dumped the tea into Boston harbor and freed America from "taxation without representation." But what is that freedom compared to this that is needed where it is again "taxation without representation," taxation to poison and damn our children and rob them of a real Redeemer and send them to hell? Let us go at this job with hoods off—and dump them into Boston harbor.

"But where will we get our professors and teachers if we dismiss all the Evolutionists?" You needn't worry; there are yet seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to this modern Baal.

"But where will we get books to teach that are not poisoned with Evolution?" In the first place, many of the old books can

be brought back to service. The books on morals and ethics of Chicago University and Brown University are pigmies compared to giants when compared with Wayland's "Moral Science" and "Morals and Ethics," by Noah K. Davis of the University of Virginia. Besides, teachers who will post themselves, can expose Evolution in the text books now in use until books free from this rotten teaching can be prepared. And it will not be long until scholars and scientists will give us proper books for education. I cannot better close this chapter than with a quotation from that brilliant Southern writer, the stalwart Editor of the Western Recorder:

"EVOLUTION'S DOGMATISM AND THE GROWING REACTION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP"

"The late John Barleycorn, whose demise and funeral rites are affirmed and denied daily in the press, had a creed. It might be epitomized in two affirmations: (1) Every day in every way makes easy the way between the bar-keeper's liquids and the consumer's pocketbook. (2) Nobody must touch my "libetry" to ruin the lives of my disciples and the lives of their families, and to debase and corrupt society.

"So does Evolution have a creed. It has failed actually to prove every one of its major hypotheses. The creed of Evolution is that certain hypotheses (defined as 'guesses' by Mr. Bryan) of science, which, if they ever could be proven would give a naturalistic origin to the universe, to the world and to all life on it, have been so nearly proven from so many angles by so many savants, that they in fact do amount to actual proof. Moreover, they say that 'all of the best scholarship is agreed' in accepting as practically proven the naturalistic theories of origin they are so acutely anxious to prove.

"Therefore, says the Evolutionist, it is true, Q. E. D. With a dogmatism never equalled by the most dogmatic spokesman of Christianity, he tells the world that no other belief in origin and growth is to be accepted but his. No dogmatic spokesman of the Christian faith ever claimed that his creed was too sacred for anybody to examine or pass an opinion upon, but himself * * * * * But that is exactly what the Evolutionists are doing concerning

their creed. While they denounce the creeds and faith of Christianity as outworn, narrow, ignorant and bigoted, they assume an autocratic superiority to all criticism and an extreme intolerance toward all who still believe they can still see God behind nature as Creator and Sustainer, and boldly affirm that their pagan philosophy is the hope of the world. It will work, they say, so soon as they can win the people from their 'religious superstition'.

"This they do against all proof to the contrary—against the notorious failure of their Rationalistic creed to make noble and morally clean the lives of most of its outstanding prophets; against Germany's catastrophic debacle, traceable directly to this creed; against the present broad-spread lawlessness and failure of moral restraints in society, which everywhere follow closely on the heels of this teaching. * * * * *

"Both in a section of the religious press and in notable current book issues there is evidence that some of the ablest Christian philosophic and scientific writers of America are increasingly grappling with this apostacy in a most powerful and convincing defense of the Bible's integrity and of Christian faith * * *

"We forbear the temptation to call attention to further developments in this unquestionable discussion. The Evolutionists themselves remind us of the priests of Baal who faced the test of fire with Elijah on Carmel. Having thrown down oodles and oodles both of smoke-screen and poisoned gas in their advance on the strongholds of revealed religion, and having found most of the secular press and not a few big preachers and some educators in Christian colleges, ready cowardly to surrender the citadel without firing a single shot, these supreme dogmatists of the New Paganism seemed astounded that the less braggart defenders of faith should not have been cowed into acquiescence.

"That is about where the awful game is at present. Since the Elijahs are more and more meeting them at the Carmel test, they are, so to speak, jumping up and down, foaming at the mouth, and crying: 'O Baal, send us more smoke-screen astuteness, more of that presumptuous swagger that scares stiff, silly, weak-kneed preachers who covet world applause more than the Spirit and power of God, and second-rate teachers who want easy reputation for being 'up-to-date'! Hear, O Baal, or these Fundamentalists and Bible-lovers will call our bluff, and the populace will find

out how empty of power and truth is our dogma of man's intellectual sufficiency without God!'

"Well we may smile. These braggarts, for all their swagger, are indeed frightened. But the situation is exceedingly grave. Because the American educational plant is largely in their hands many of them are honored in the highest places. God's people should pray much, also study much.

"We beg the pardon of sensitive readers for our plain words descriptive of us all. We rail no man's person. But of the swagger, insolent, conceited, Baal-incantation, intolerant, deceptive, insulting dogma of the pagan philosophy of Evolution, sitting highly enthroned in the directorate of the educational machinery of this nation, where its presence is a plain negation of our national constitutional provision against religious sectarianism in State schools, we find it difficult to speak without expressing something of the absolute revolt of our whole soul. Men of God, who quail not before exalted enemies of our holy faith, does not the situation call for such a response?"

The Catholics have been wont to say that our public schools are infidel schools. That comes with poor grace from them, when they helped drive the Bible from the public schools. But we have been in the habit of retorting "It's a lie!" It's not a lie; it is the truth.

How comes it that every Unitarian preacher (every one of whom believes that the Saviour was the bastard, illegitimate son of a fallen woman) and that every infidel lecturer are Evolutionists? They have their infidelity taught in the public schools, but the rest of us are shut out and must stand by and let our children be turned from the Bible as God's word, and from the Saviour as Redeemer and turned into hell, and be forced to pay for it with our taxes.

George McCready Price tells that Josiah Strong and several noted men were traveling in Palestine, and on a hot day some of them drank from a stream called "Elisha's Fountain." Later, on the upper waters of the stream they came upon an Arab camp and learned that several of the Arabs were suffering from typhoid fever, and that the clothing of the sick people had been washed in the waters of the stream. Not long after, a Mr. Babcock of the party died of the typhoid fever. Our legislatures are letting the Evolutionists wash their typhoid fever clothing in

the stream Education, from which our children are to drink; the local Board of Trustees of the Public Schools are giving their consent to it, and you, Baptist, Catholic, Congregationalist, Disciple, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian and other fathers and mothers, stand by in indifference and see your children drink and die, when it is in your power, through your Boards of Trustees of tax-supported schools and through your legislatures to protect them.

My work is done; I've done what I could; but my pen lingers. Through the fast-falling tears as I write the closing lines of this book, I see a vision floating before my eyes of the hundreds of thousands of our bright-faced boys and girls, noble and ambitious young men attending our tax-supported schools and their fathers and mothers in indifference consenting to the death of their souls, when they can, if they really will, save them from this greatest, most insidious curse that ever fell upon this earth. Oh, that I could take these young people in my arms and shield them from this blighting curse and hand them up to God!

BOOKS BY T. T. MARTIN

God's Plan with Men.....$1.50
Redemption and the New Birth.....$1.50
Going to Hell in Droves..... .25
Married Life; It's Present Day Dangers and Evils ..... .25
The Second Coming of Christ ..... .25
The New Testament Church..... .25
Heaven, Hell and Other Sermons..... 1.50

In Preparation:
The Samson of the West and
The Delilah of the East.....$1.50 and $1.00

Order From the Author
BLUE MOUNTAIN,
MISSISSIPPI.

BOOKS EXPOSING EVOLUTION

1. "God or Gorilla," by Alfred W. McCann, L.L. D. Price $3.00. It is a terrific, but just exposure of Evolution and some leading Evolutionists. They will never answer it—they can't.
2. "The Other Side of Evolution," by Alexander Patterson. A powerful, convincing book.
3. "Origin and Antiquity of Man," by G. Frederick Wright.
4. "Man and the Glacial Period," by G. Frederick Wright.
5. "Evolution—A Menace," by J. W. Porter. A small book, but convincing and unanswerable.
6. "In His Image," by Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan. One chapter specially devoted to Evolution, but a fearful arraignment.
7. "Evolution of the Bar," by Philip Mauro. Another small, but convincing and unanswerable book.
8. "Evolution or Creation," by L. T. Townsend. Clear and powerful.
9. "Organic Evolution Considered," by Alfred Fairhurst, A. M., D. Sci. A scientist who meets the Evolutionist on his own ground and crushes him; a great book.
10. "Theistic Evolution," by Alfred Fairhurst, A. M., D. Sci. A small work, but equally convincing.
11. "Q. E. D.," by George McCready Price, a scientist. Convincing and strong.
12. "The Fundamentals of Geology," by George McCready Price. Of equal ability with "Q. E. D."
13. "The Collapse of Evolution," by L. T. Townsend. The best book of its size on the subject.
14. "The Credulity of Incredulity," by Arthur T. Pierson. Presbyterian Board of Publication. A splendid pamphlet.
15. "The Menace of Darwinism," by William Jennings Bryan. Pentecostal Publishing Company, Louisville, Ky. A powerful pamphlet.
16. "What About Evolution?" by W. H. Griffith Thomas. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.
17. Gridley. "The First Chapter of Genesis as the Rock Foundation for Science and Religion." "An able discussion of Evolution."
18. "Organic Evolution," A. L. Gridley.
19. "New Light on the Doctrines of Creation by George McCready Price, Scientist. "A most able discussion by a geologist."
20. "Evolution Criticised," by T. B. Bishop. Oliphant's, London, England. A valuable book.

61A C955 6

Date Due

NOV 17 '56	MAY 12 '70		
Oct 10 '56	OCT 8 '70		
MAY 2 9 '57	OCT 27 '70		
AUG 12 '59	NOV 13 '70		
MAY 21 '60	JUN 18 '71		
FEB 1 '61	SEP 14 '72		
MAY 7 '61			
[illegible]			
MAY 7 '62			
JUN 22 '62			
19. 9 JUL			
JUL 3 '62			
NOV 20 '62			
JUL 3 '64			
AP 9 '65			
AP 25 '67			
MAR 31 '70			

215 ✓
M365h
M. C.
Alumni Publications

20486

215 20486
M365h
AUTHOR

Martinn T. T.
TITLE

Hell and the High Schools

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME
NOV 17	Henry Roberts
Oct 10 '56	Don Hedron
MAY 2 8 '57	Ralph West
Aug 10	Jane Lewis
MAY 2 1 '60	Jack Wyle
FEB 1 '61	David E
MAY [illegible]	[illegible]
JUN 2 2 '61	Z
JUL 5 '61	
JUL 3 '62	
NOV 2 8	